Pacific School of
Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/expositor-1875_1920_20

THE EXPOSITOR

VOL. XX.

List of Contributors to Volume XX

Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D.
Rev. Professor Vernon Bartlet, D.D.
Rev. W. Ernest Beet, M.A., Litt.D.
Rev. T. Herbert Bindley, D.D.
Professor Vacher Burch.
Rev. Professor C. F. Burney, Litt.D.
Rev. J. Robertson Cameron, D.D.
Rev. Professor J. A. Findlay, M.A.
Rev. Canon J. Battersby Harford, M.A.
Professor Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D.
Rev. John A. Hutton, D.D.
Rev. Professor George Jackson, B.A., D.D.
Rev. J. G. James, D.D.
Rev. J. P. Lilley, D.D.
Rev. Professor John E. McFadyen, D.D.
Rev. John G. McKenzie, B.A.
Rev. Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.D.
Rev. Professor D. S. Margoliouth, Litt.D.
Rev. Professor Rabbi A. Marmorstein, Ph.D.
Rev. Professor J. Hugh Michael, M.A.
Rev. Professor James Moffatt, D.D., Litt.D.
Professor A. S. Peake, D.D.
Rev. Professor A. T. Robertson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D.
Rev. Professor T. H. Robinson, M.A., B.D.
Rev. J. M. E. Ross, M.A.
Rev. Professor J. M. Shaw, M.A.
Rev. E. Shillito, M.A.
Professor A. Souter, Litt.D.
Rev. Professor James Stalker, D.D.
A. T. Swaine.
Rev. H. C. A. Townsend, D.D.
Rev. Professor Adam C. Welch, D.D.
Rev. G. H. Whitaker, M.A.
Rev. E. W. Winstanley, D.D.

THE EXPOSITOR

EDITED BY THE REV.

SIR W. ROBERTSON NICOLL,
M.A., D.D., LL.D.

EIGHTH SERIES

Volume XX

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.

MCMXX

567.8
Y.20
1920:2

Printed in Great Britain
by Butler & Tanner,
Frome and London

THE CHRIST OF LUKE'S GOSPEL.

In Luke's Gospel we have the picture of Christ drawn by the historian and artist after long experience of His power and diligent research into the sources of information about His work and claims. The conclusion is the result of investigation.

1. *The Jesus or Christ Controversy.*

Luke was not one of the eye-witnesses [1] of Christ, but he was one of the witnesses [2] to the work of Christ. He was a critic of the effect of Christ's personal influence on men who knew Him in the flesh and who worshipped Him as God and Saviour. Luke had to face squarely the problem of Jesus as the Christ (the Messiah). It was put up to him by the eye-witnesses. Luke, as we know, was not a Jew, and so was not expecting a Messiah. He was not prejudiced against Jesus as were the Pharisees with their theory of a political and eschatological kingdom for the Messiah. But the heathen myths made it more difficult, if anything, for him to accept the facts about the Incarnation of Christ, the Virgin Birth, and Christ's Resurrection from the dead. Certainly, the emperor-worship was enough to disgust any intelligent man, as it did most of the men of light of that time. It was not easy for an educated man in Luke's day to accept the deity of Jesus and to worship a man. The Cross of Jesus was a stumbling-

[1] *αὐτόπται.*

[2] *μάρτυρες.*

block to the Jew and foolishness to the Greek. Luke felt the force of both objections.

Luke is the typical man of culture of his time. He does not tell the mental processes by which he came to take Jesus as the Christ. But we may be sure that he would understand the temper of the modern college man or woman who finds difficulty in reconciling the deity of Jesus with modern Darwinism. It was just as hard for Luke to make the Person of Christ square with the scientific theories of Galen and Hippocrates. We must try to understand the problems of the college and university life of our day. I wish to recommend McKenna's *The Adventure of Life* as a book admirably adapted to help the really sincere spirits who wish to face the facts of nature and of grace. This English physician and devout Christian wrote his book in his den at the front in France in the midst of death and life. He is a man after Luke's own heart and looks at all the facts with a calm and clear gaze. He is an evolutionist and gives his conception of the development of the universe up to man. Then he finds a place for Jesus, the Son of God, in the scientific universe of Darwin and he worships Him as his Saviour from sin. It is utterly frank and very able and helpful. It is just as gratuitous to accuse Luke of credulity as McKenna. One is bound to believe that Luke had an experience of Christ in his heart and life before he clearly grasped the conception of the Person of Christ. Glover in his *Jesus of History* likewise understands Luke and the temper of modern young people of culture with a craving to know Christ. We may be sure that Luke did not write carelessly the tremendous statements concerning the deity of Jesus. He writes in the light of his own extensive researches, after long investigation of the claims and the power of Christ, and out of a full heart. He had himself put Jesus to the test in his own life. He had seen

others live for Christ and die for Christ. Luke loved his medical science, but he loved Jesus more. He was a "doctor of the old school" who was able to make the sick-room a sanctuary of God. He was a partner with God and looked to the Great Physician to bless his work.

Luke wrote with the Logia before him. The Logia (Q) had precisely the same elements [1] in its picture of Christ that we find in the Gospel of John.[2] Mark [3] wrote before Luke and Mark's picture of Christ agrees with that of the Logia. Luke was Paul's bosom friend. Luke knew Paul's idea of Christ. So Luke had to face the Jesus or Christ Controversy of modern theologians.[4] He identified the theological Christ with the historic Jesus. He did not do so blindly. From the beginning he found the evidence that convinced him. It is a modern intellectual impertinence that men of culture do not accept the deity of Jesus. Gladstone says that out of sixty master minds that he knew fifty-five of them took Jesus humbly as God and Saviour.

Luke the historian records his idea of the Person of Christ. He does not use Pauline terminology. He follows the language of his primitive sources. He lets us see that the witness is very old and goes back to the very life of Christ. It is not a theological dogma of a late date invented to suit the deification of Jesus. Luke writes in a true historic spirit and lets us see how Jesus impressed the men of his time and how Jesus regarded Himself.

2. *The Son of God.*

Luke does not write as a theologian. He does not express his own views in theological language as Paul does in his

[1] See my article, "The Christ of the Logia," in the *Contemporary Review* August, 1919.

[2] See my *Divinity of Christ in the Gospel of John* (1916).

[3] See my *Studies in Mark's Gospel* (1919).

[4] Cf. *The Hibbert Journal Supplement for* 1909.

Epistles. He makes no theological arguments or definitions. He keeps his own personality in the background, but he reveals his own views by the nature of the material that he presents. We may agree or disagree with Luke's picture of Christ, but he has drawn it with absolute clearness and after mature reflection and with manifest conviction. He comes to the interpretation of Christ without Pharisaic limitations and from the standpoint of a cosmopolitan. Wright [1] thinks that Luke had conversations with John, the author of the Fourth Gospel, since both mention the fact that the sepulchre in which our Lord's body lay was a new one, "where no one had yet lain" (Luke xxiii. 53). He thinks that much of John's teaching was "esoteric, intended for advanced disciples only," but there are Johannine patches in Luke's Gospel, as, for instance, Luke x. 21-24 (cf. Matt. xi. 25-30). Be that as it may, it can be shown that Luke conceived Jesus as the Son of God in the full sense of that phrase. He has not written his Gospel to prove that thesis as John has done in his Gospel (xx. 30 f.), but in numerous instances he shows clearly what he means his readers to understand about Jesus.

Luke records the angel Gabriel as saying to Mary of the promised child: "He shall be great, and shall be called the son of the Most High: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke i. 32-33). This is, to be sure, the Old Testament picture in broad outline of the Messiah, but not the Pharisaic conception. In 2 Samuel vii. 5-17 Nathan's words to David from Jehovah are recorded. David's son is to build Jehovah a house and the throne of his kingdom is to be established forever. This covenant with David is referred to at length in Psalm lxxxix., where it is

[1] Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*,

interpreted in Messianic language. Nearly all of the language of Christ's words to Peter in Matthew xvi. 18 f. appears in Psalm lxxxix. We need not think that David or Nathan or the author of Psalm lxxxix. understood the language about the perpetuity of the Davidic throne in the spiritual sense as Jesus interprets it in Matthew xvi. 18 f. Luke clearly understands the words of Gabriel to Mary in the sense of the spiritual Israel that Paul teaches in Galatians iii. and Romans ix.–xi. The context in Luke's Gospel shows that he means us to understand that by "the son of the Most High" he is describing the real deity of Jesus.

Jesus is human on the side of his mother Mary, but is begotten of the Holy Spirit. When Mary expressed her wonder and surprise Gabriel replies: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and shall overshadow thee: wherefore also the holy thing which is begotten of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke i. 35). The idea of the Shekinah is suggested here (Ex. xi. 38). "The cloud of glory signified the Divine presence and power."[1] The unborn child is called "holy" as free from all taint of sin.[2] There is no discounting the fact that Luke endorses these words of Gabriel as a true forecast of the life of Jesus which he will present in his Gospel. Luke believed the simple story of Mary about the birth of Jesus. Thus he interprets the Incarnation of the Son of God. Efforts have been made to empty the words "the Son of God"[3] of their natural content, but with no success. True, Adam is called by Luke the son of God in iii. 38, but the context is utterly different. God created Adam, but begot Jesus by the Holy Spirit. Adam was not an incarnation of God, but God's offspring as all men are (Acts xvii. 28).

[1] Plummer, *in loco.* [2] *Ibid.*

[3] υἱὸς Θεοῦ. The use of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ would have made the point clearer. Luke probably translates from the Aramaic.

And then Elizabeth greets Mary as "the mother of my Lord" [1] (Luke i. 43). Here the word "Lord" is not a mere title of rank or even in the sense ascribed in the papyri so often to Cæsar, but it is the Old Testament usage as in Psalm xc. 1. Elizabeth means Messiah by Lord. Plummer [2] properly notes that the expression "Mother of God" does not occur in the Bible. Didon [3] wrongly translates the language of Luke i. 43 by "la mère de mon Dieu." But the Greek word for Lord in the Septuagint commonly occurs for the Hebrew Jehovah.

The shepherds hear the angels describe the Babe of Bethlehem as "a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord." [4] It is possible to say that Luke, if translating an Aramaic source, whether oral or written, may have followed the Septuagint in Lamentations iv. 20, where "the anointed of the Lord" is rendered by "the Anointed Lord." [5] The same peculiar expression occurs in Psalms of Solomon xvii. 36. "The combination occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, and the precise meaning is uncertain. Either "Messiah, Lord," or "Anointed Lord," or "the Messiah, the Lord," or "an anointed one, a Lord." [6] But it is at any rate plain that the highest dignity is here ascribed to the child Jesus.

In Luke ii. 26 we read that Simeon had had a revelation that he should not die before he had seen "the Lord's Christ" [7] or "the Lord's Anointed" (cf. Lam. iv. 20). Here the deity of Jesus is not brought out save as it belongs to the word "Anointed" or Messiah. One may compare Luke ix. 20 where Luke has "the Christ (the Anointed)

[1] ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου μου.
[2] Comm., p. 29.
[3] *Jésus Christ*, p. 111.
[4] σωτὴρ ὅς ἐστιν Χριστὸς Κύριος.
[5] Χριστὸς Κύριος. Cf. Ps. xc. 1 and Sirach li. 10.
[6] Plummer, *in loco*.
[7] τὸν Χριστὸν Κυρίου

of God" (Mark viii. 29 "the Christ"; Matt. xvi. 17 "the Christ the Son of the living God").

In Luke ii. 49 the boy Jesus expresses surprise that Joseph and Mary do not understand that "I must be in my Father's house."[1] This is the correct translation, as the papyri show, not "about my Father's business." But here is the Messianic consciousness in the boy of twelve. God is His Father in a sense not true of other men. The Jews later accused Jesus of blasphemy for calling God "His own Father, and making Himself equal with God" (John v. 18).

At the baptism of Jesus "a voice came out of heaven, "Thou art my beloved Son;[2] in thee I am well pleased" (Luke iii. 22 = Mark i. 11 = Matt. iii. 17). It is possible that the voice of the Father suggested Psalm ii. 7 which D here follows. But it is beyond question that the Synoptic Gospels here present the deity of Jesus as clearly as does the Gospel of John. It is given, moreover, at the very beginning of Christ's ministry, not merely at the close. It comes not as a new revelation to Jesus, but as confirmation of His peculiar relation to the Father. John the Baptist saw the descent of the Holy Spirit as the sign (John i. 33) and he heard the Voice of the Father: "And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God" (i. 34). This is no mere *Bath-Kol* of the rabbis, an echo of God's voice. It is not the Cerinthian Gnostic idea of an emanation upon Jesus, the "Christ" coming upon the man Jesus. Jesus does not here "become" God or the Son of God. As the Son of God, He is recognised by the Father on the formal entrance upon His Messianic mission in the presence and with the sanction of the Forerunner. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit unite on this august occasion in setting this seal upon the solemn event.

[1] ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναί με. [2] ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός.

In the temptations the devil twice (Luke iv. 3, 9) challenges Christ's relation to God by the words "If thou art the Son of God,"[1] or more exactly "If thou art Son of God." There is no article with "Son" in the Greek. There is undoubted allusion to the Voice of the Father at the baptism (Luke iii. 22), but the reference is "to the relationship to God, rather than to the office of Messiah."[2] The condition, being of the first-class,[3] assumes the fact of Christ's peculiar relationship to God, though possibly enjoyed by others. The devil does not throw doubt on his own temptation, but seeks to incite doubt in Jesus by urging Him to prove that He is in reality God's Son by the exercising of the power of God.

In the discourse in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke iv. 16–30) Jesus read from the roll of Isaiah (lxi. 1–2; lviii. 6) and definitely claims that this Messianic passage is fulfilled in Him (Luke iv. 21). There is no specific claim to deity here save as that is involved in Christ's conception of the Messiah. "In applying these words to Himself the Christ looks back to His baptism. He is more than a Prophet; He is the Son, the Beloved One, of Jehovah (iii. 21, 22)."[4]

The Pharisees challenged the right of Christ to forgive sins by saying: "Who can forgive sins, but God alone?" (Luke v. 21). Jesus does not dispute the point raised, but accepts the challenge and heals the man on purpose "that ye may know that the Son of Man hath authority on earth to forgive sins" (v. 24). He acts on His own authority in perfect accord with the will of God (John v. 19, 21). He

[1] *εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ*. Note emphatic position of *υἱὸς*. On absence of article see Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 781.

[2] Plummer, *in loco*.

[3] Cf. Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 1009.

[4] Plummer, *in loco*.

allows the Pharisees and the people to draw the conclusion that he claims divine prerogatives.

In Luke vi. 5 Jesus claims to be "Lord of the Sabbath" with power to change or cancel the day as it suits best His work. This is not a direct claim to equality with God, but is a revolutionary position from the usual Pharisaic theology which made men slaves of the Sabbath.

One does not care to press the point in the language of the demoniac in Luke viii. 28, who says: "Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God." The word "God" is not certain in the text, and "Most High" is a common name for Jehovah among heathen nations.[1] Perhaps the man was a heathen. The demoniacs quickly acknowledge the deity of Jesus, a fact that was turned against Jesus by the rabbis, who used it as a proof that He was in league with the devil. But Luke records the fact and lets his readers draw their own inferences. Devil and demons alike acknowledge Jesus as God's Son in Luke's Gospel.

We have already seen that in Luke ix. 20 Peter addresses Jesus as "the Christ of God," while Matthew xvi. 16 has "the Christ, the Son of the living God." Luke's briefer form involves Matthew's longer report.

On the Mount of Transfiguration Luke (ix. 35) records that "a voice came out of the cloud, saying: This is my Son, my chosen: hear ye him." Here many manuscripts,[2] like Matthew xvii. 5 and Mark ix. 7, have "my beloved Son" as in Luke iii. 22. But the variation in the verbal or participle cuts no figure in the testimony of the Father to the peculiar Sonship[3] of Jesus. Luke has points of his own concerning this great event (Christ's praying, the talk about Christ's decease).

[1] See proof in Plummer's Comm., p. 229.
[2] A C D P R.
[3] ὁ υἱός μου. Note article.

In Luke x. 22 (=Matt. xi. 27) Jesus claims equality with the Father by the use of "the Father," "the Son" as so often in John's Gospel (cf. v. 19–20). "And it contains the whole of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel. It is like an aerolite from the Johannean heaven" [1]! and for that very reason it causes perplexity to those who deny the solidarity between the Johannean heaven and the Synoptic earth.[2]

When on trial before the Sanhedrin Jesus is finally asked pointedly by Caiaphas if He is the Christ (Luke xxii. 67) and then by all: "Art thou then the Son of God?" (xxii. 70). To this He replied: "Ye say that I am," a virtual affirmative. Luke only gives the ratification after dawn (xxii. 66) of the illegal condemnation before day given in detail by Matthew and Mark. Matthew (xxvi. 63) represents Christ as put on oath by Caiaphas to tell "whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God," to which Jesus gives an affirmative answer (Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62). It is all perfunctory repetition in Luke, but the same point is clearly made that Jesus before the Sanhedrin solemnly claims to be the Son of God. On this confession of His the vote was twice taken to convict Him of blasphemy. Clearly, therefore, the Sanhedrin understood Jesus to make divine claims. Jesus had said in so many words: "But from henceforth shall the Son of Man be seated at the right hand of the power of God" (xxii. 69). "In the allusion to Daniel vii. 13 they recognise a claim to Divinity." [3] In simple truth, Luke records that the Sanhedrin voted Jesus to be worthy of death because He claimed to be the Son of God and so equal with God.

Once more Luke represents the Risen Christ as claiming

[1] Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, p. 527.
[2] Plummer, p. 282.
[3] Plummer, p. 519.

that He is the Messiah of old Testament prophecy whose sufferings were already foretold (Luke xxiv. 26, 46).

The case is made out with abundant clearness that Luke's Gospel gives us a picture of one who claimed to be the Son of God in the full sense of that phrase. Luke presents the real deity of Jesus, not the mere divinity of humanity. In a word, Jesus is the Son of God in the same sense that He appears in the Fourth Gospel, though John's philosophical language in the Prologue is not employed. We see this conception of Christ in Mary's Memorials in chapters i. and ii., in the portions of Luke drawn from Mark and from Q, in the Perean and Passion Narratives. It is futile to try to make Luke's Christ a mere man, even the best of men. From the Virgin Birth to the Ascension we see the Son of God limned by Luke the Painter and the Historian.

3. *The Son of Man.*

But Luke is not a Docetic Gnostic any more than a Cerinthian Gnostic. If Jesus is the Son of God in Luke's Gospel, He is none the less the Son of Man. Jesus is a real man and not a make-believe man without genuine humanity. Luke's Gospel is that of "Jesus, our Brother-Man." [1] The Jesus of Luke's Gospel is no pale-faced dreamer out of touch with his environment. As a physician Luke takes special delight in showing the phases and features of His human birth and development side by side with the manifest deity of Jesus Christ.

Jesus is the child of Mary and is from the most humble surroundings with no comforts for mother or child (Luke ii. 4–7). Here we see the physician's tender interest in the details of the birth.

Like any other child Jesus "grew, and waxed strong,

[1] Hayes, *Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, p. 253.

filled with wisdom ; and the grace of God was upon him " (ii. 40). Luke alone gives the picture of the boy Jesus in the temple and His obedience to Joseph and Mary : " And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man " (ii. 52). Luke does not moralise or dogmatise about the wonder of these words. With wondrous skill he helps us to see the human growth of the Son of God who is also the Son of Man.

The tender sympathy of Jesus is apparent at every turn in Luke's Gospel in His love for sinners and His pity for the sick and the suffering. Luke pictures Jesus as weeping over Jerusalem that was to reject Him (xix. 41–4). Luke says that in the agony in Gethsemane " His sweat became as it were great drops of blood falling down upon the ground " (xxii. 44). Even after the resurrection of Jesus Luke emphasises the fact that Jesus was more than a mere ghost by His asking His disciples to handle Him and by His eating a piece of broiled fish (xxiv. 38–43), difficult as it is for us to comprehend this transition stage in the body of Christ.

Like the other Gospels, Luke's Gospel reports Jesus as claiming to be the Son of Man and yet no one of the Evangelists calls Jesus by this term. It is always used by Christ in the more than eighty instances in the Gospels. This agreement is not mere coincidence and argues strongly for the genuineness of the language. And yet there is great disagreement among modern scholars as to the origin and the significance of the expression. Abbott has an exhaustive treatment of every phase of the subject in his notable monograph.[1] It is vain to try to find the Aramaic *barnasha*, a man, any one, in some of the crucial passages in the Gospels, however possible in others. It is plain in Luke, as in the other Gospels, that Christ's enemies understood him to make a Messianic claim by the use of " the Son of

[1] *The Son of Man, or Contributions to the Study of the Thoughts of Jesus.*

Man." That is seen in Luke xxii. 69, where Jesus calls Himself "the Son of Man" who will "be seated at the right hand of the power of God." The Sanhedrin then retort: "Art thou then the Son of God?" The two terms are not interchangeable, but evidently there is a bond of unity. If Jesus had simply claimed to be a man, there would be no meaning in the question. So also in John xii. 34 the multitude identify "the Christ" (Messiah) with "Son of Man." In the Book of Enoch the Son of Man has a Messianic connotation, though it is not clear whether all of the book is pre-Christian or not. The word occurs in Ezekiel as his title and it is in Daniel vii. 13 f. as "one like a Son of Man." The expression emphasises the humanity of Christ and also His representative position as the ideal and perfect man. But it also presents in popular apprehension the claim to the Messiahship without using the technical word Messiah. Thus Jesus avoided a technical issue with His enemies till His hour had come. But the very phrase that reveals the true humanity of Jesus implies that He is more than a man. The Son of Man is the Son of God, else He could not really be the Son of Man.

So then Luke really means that Jesus in His human life, though absolutely genuine, is in a state of voluntary humiliation, as Paul explains in 2 Corinthians viii. 9 and Philippians ii. 5–11. He had the limitations of weariness and suffering and sorrow and pain and death. Jesus battled with wrong at every turn. He clashed with the ecclesiastical hypocrites of the time who crucified Him for His spiritual reality and hostility to sham. In His very humanity Jesus reveals His deity and is the hope of the race.

4. *The Saviour of Sinners.*

Christ is the great humanitarian of the ages, but He is more. Jesus has drawn the picture of the Good Samaritan

with his disregard for caste and race and religious prejudice and his sheer pity for a man in trouble. Jesus was the friend of the poor, of the sick, of the suffering. The lepers were not afraid to draw nigh to Him. The blind cried out after Jesus when He passed by. Even the dead heard His voice and came back to life. Jesus brought health and healing at every step. He carried light and life with Him to all who wished it. Jesus is the true philanthropist. Nowhere is He pictured with such attractive power as He went about doing good as in Luke's Gospel. The very heart of Luke went out to Jesus in His deeds of mercy.

But there is a deeper note than all this blessed work of social amelioration. Jesus is the Saviour from sin in Luke's Gospel. He is the friend of publicans and sinners, not to condone their sins or to join in them, but to win them from their sins. Luke's Christ is Mr. H. G. Wells' " Limited God " right down in the midst of sinners, right down in the trenches, struggling and fighting evil in its lair. Jesus not merely has sympathy with the suffering and the sinful. He has love for the souls of the lost. He has power to help men. Jesus sees the Cross ahead of Him as the way to win the lost. He makes the plain prediction (ix. 43 f.) to Peter (Luke ix. 20–7) and repeats it. He knows the cost of redemption from sin and He means to pay the price with His life. It is no mythical " dying god " of the autumn who rises, according to the myth, in the spring, as the mystery-religions teach. Jesus sees His baptism of death (xii. 49–53) before it comes. Jesus is conscious that He is dying for men (xxii. 19 ff.). Substitution is not so hard to understand now as it was before the great war. Luke's account of the death on the Cross (xxiii. 32–54) and of the resurrection from the dead is all in harmony with the Pauline gospel of the death of Christ for the salvation of the sinner. In Luke we have the Son of God and the Son of Man giving

Himself as the victim of sin to save the sinner. The Gospel of Luke has often been called the Gospel of Sacrifice. "The Son of Man must suffer many things" (Luke ix. 22). And Jesus Himself will explain to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus: "Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?" (xxiv. 26).

5. *The Captain of our Salvation.*

Luke gives us a Christ with a world program. The Risen Christ on Olivet (a wondrous picture) interprets His sufferings, death and resurrection as preliminary to the proclamation of repentance and remission of sins to the whole world (Luke xxiv. 46–9). The disciples were to tarry in Jerusalem till clothed with power from on high and then they were to fare forth to the conquest of the world. The Gospel closes with this promise of divine energy (power, *dunamis*, dynamite) to carry out this vast undertaking. The Acts opens with the same promise of the Father for which they were to wait, but which was near and which did come at the great Pentecost. Jesus did not leave the disciples in gloom. They were in darkness at His death, but were full of joy at His Ascension (Luke xxiv. 52). The greatest revolution in human history took place in the short space of fifty days. Defeat was turned into victory. The Cross became the sign of conquest.

Jesus lives as the Leader of men with the forward look who hope for better days and better men. Luke's Christ is the Risen Jesus who carries on the work that He began (Acts i. 1). The Acts, like the Gospel, records the words and deeds of Jesus. This is Luke's conception of Christ. He would probably not have written those two books at all if they only recorded ancient history that was over and done. Luke had a profound conviction that he was recording the origin of a movement that was to go to the

uttermost part of the earth. The Kingdom of Christ was to overturn the Kingdom of Satan. Christ was to overcome Cæsar. Luke saw victory in the future. Hence he wrote. He lived to see the proof of the promise. The Acts justifies the Gospel. Paul answered the call of Christ. The Roman Empire would fall at the feet of Jesus. The conflict was to be longer than Luke knew, but he was sure that in the end of the day Jesus would win, for He is the Son of God who is now leading the forces of righteousness on earth from His throne in heaven.

The Holy Spirit is the Vice-gerent of Christ on earth, not the Pope of Rome. The Holy Spirit is the Power of Christ on earth for all men who will let Him use them. So the battle goes on. The program of Christ is not yet completed. He is coming back some day. But that promise and that hope should be an incentive to greater zeal in carrying out Christ's program, not a sedative to endeavour. Optimism, not pessimism, is the keynote of Luke's Gospel and the Acts. Jesus is risen and reigns. Paul carries the gospel over the Roman Empire. You and I are to carry the torch to the uttermost part of the earth. We have Luke's Gospel with its wondrous picture of Christ to take with us. We have the Acts with the marvellous story of the Power of the Holy Spirit to cheer us. Jesus is King. Let us crown Him. That is what Luke means by his Gospel and Acts.

A. T. Robertson.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH.[1]

In no branch of scholarship has the last generation witnessed a greater advance than in the study of the Old Testament. This has been noticeable from many sides, and archæology and research of other kinds have contributed to the result. And whilst this advance has been more or less general throughout the field, it has been as marked in the criticism of the prophets as anywhere else. One is struck by the difference in critical outlook between such a Commentary as Marti's on Isaiah, or Duhm's on Jeremiah on the one hand, and that of Gray on Isaiah i.–xxvii. on the other. The earlier scholars seem to have thought of the prophet as a man of the study. They spoke of him as compiling long connected passages, and the effort was always made to show the connexion between one paragraph and the next. This feeling was, perhaps, unconscious, and was never clearly formulated, but it is very obvious that some such presupposition was in the minds of most if not all commentators on the prophets till fifteen years ago.

Yet there were facts generally admitted which would tend to establish a different view. It was granted that the prophetic books contain a large amount of poetry, and that this poetry seems to be in somewhat small sections. Yet these sections were too often called strophes (cf. Harper's work on Hosea and Amos), and were assumed to be the component parts of longer poems. It was also realised that the ecstatic experience played at least some part in the prophetic utterance, and here the most modern of students often hesitate to take a further advance. Yet the actual

[1] A paper read before the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society, December, 1919.

form of the poems, with their repeated changes of rhythm, and the character of the ecstasy, which rendered short utterances the rule rather than long ones, and inevitably precluded anything of the nature of reasoned argument sustained through a long passage, should have pointed the way to a juster appreciation of the character of the material from which the books themselves were compiled.

To-day the necessary deductions have been drawn, and it is realised that the original oracle, ecstatic or not, was usually of the briefest, often no more than a single Massoretic verse, and seldom extending to more than about half a dozen. It is realised, too, that the books themselves have passed through a much more complicated process of redaction than the earlier critics had supposed. The prophet himself may, and did in some cases, make a collection of his own oracles, but that collection must frequently have been of very small dimensions, and there must have been a great deal which, passing under the name of one or other of the well-known prophets, remained in the form of isolated fragments. Such fragments often continued to maintain an independent existence even after they had been included in the larger sections, and not infrequently the student of the Prophets is faced with parallel passages which differ but slightly from one another in different portions of his field. This phenomenon is entirely obvious in cases where the same passage appears in two different books, but there are instances in which the same oracle is found in two or more places even in the same book. The old view explained the former type on what we may call the "study" principle, by assuming that one prophet, in writing his book, had copied from another, or that both were copying from a common source. Illustrations of this fact may be seen in the controversies which have arisen with regard to the original position and authorship of such passages as Isaiah

ii. 2–4=Micah iv. 1–4, and the oracles which appear both in the book of Jeremiah and in that of Obadiah. The first is particularly instructive from one point of view. In the case of Isaiah, the passage stands at the head of one of the minor collections of which the book is composed, and in that of Micah it stands at the end of those sections which are definitely attributed to the prophet himself. (Indeed, the verse which immediately precedes it is the best attested verse in the whole of the Old Testament, being quoted as Micah's in Jeremiah xxvi. 18 f.). Nothing could be clearer than the fact that this was a "floating" oracle, which one compiler thought would make a good introduction and another found suitable for a conclusion. In the case of the Obadiah passage it appears at once that the book is nothing but a collection of stray oracles and oracular fragments all dealing ostensibly with Edom. Such collections were common though they are usually included within the volumes bearing the names of the "greater" prophets. The later chapters of the Book of Jeremiah offer an admirable illustration.

A good instance of an oracle which, with slight modification, appears in two places in the same book is to be seen in the case of Jeremiah vi. 22–26, of which the first part appears also in l. 41–43. Some very significant facts emerge on a comparison between these two passages. The first is that the oracle in chap. iv. is concerned with Israel, in l. with Babylon, and slight changes have been made to adapt it to its new object. The second is that it is mutilated in l. There is no reason whatever to make a break at the end of vi. 24, and to regard vers. 25–26 as belonging to a different oracle. It follows that the other form has been accidentally cut short. The third is that in respect to what is left in l. the text is more accurate than it is in vi., as can be seen by the application of a simple metrical test. If the two are placed side by side, this is seen at once :—

vi. 22	l. 41
הנה עם־בא מארץ צפון	הנה עם־בא מצפון ונוי
ונוי גדול	גדול
יעור מירכתי ארץ	ומלכים רבים יערו
	מירכתי ארץ

It is obvious that the insertion of ארץ and the omission of ומלכים רבים in the first four lines completely disorganise the rhythm, thus establishing the reading of chap. l. as being nearer the original. This obviously opens a wide field for speculation in the realm of textual criticism. The Metriker may have more justification in some of his emendations than some of us have suspected.

We have thus reached the primitive—or sufficiently primitive for our purpose—form of the material from which the prophetic books were compiled. We are carried back to a state of affairs when there was a whole mass of these oracular fragments in a more or less mutilated state, sometimes copied singly or from memory, and often undergoing a certain amount of alteration, accidental or deliberate, in the process. To-day we have them embodied in longer or shorter collections bearing the names of the great heroes of the prophetic world, and purporting to be their more or less continuous utterance. Our next step must be an analytical one. We must see where and how these oracles began and ended. That all were once separate and individual is not proved, but such evidence as is available points in that direction, and we are entitled to assume it as a working hypothesis. It must always be remembered that the prophet may himself have been the first compiler, and that in this case the oracles may never have been written down till he himself put them together. This seems to have been true of Jeremiah, though the instance quoted from chaps. vi. and l. would appear to suggest that, even if Jeremiah had never written anything down, others may have done so without his consent or knowledge.

The isolation of the individual oracle is, then, the next task which confronts us. There are three criteria which may help us to decide as to the beginning or end of an individual oracle. The first of these is the presence of some introductory or concluding phrase. Thus we find very frequently at the beginning of an oracle the words כה אמר יהוה, and at the end נאם יהוה. The first of these serves to emphasise what follows, the second is a kind of signature, indicating the true source from which the message comes. Both are not infrequently expanded, often by the addition of epithets to the divine name. It does not follow that in every case where these phrases occur we have the "joint" between two oracles, but this will be found to be true in the vast majority of instances. For one thing, this coincides frequently with other tests. The second of these is that of the subject matter. As has already been noted, the conditions of the ecstasy -and whether all prophecy was ecstatic or not, it is clear that the ecstatic form was origina and its characteristics dominated all prophecy in the strict sense of the term -required the oracle to be a short out burst embodying feeling and emotion rather than a reasonec continuity of thought. A change of subject will, then indicate the beginning of a new oracle, which originally may have had no connexion whatever with the preceding one A good instance is to be seen in Jeremiah vi. 22-30. Verses 22-26—already mentioned deal with a foreign enemy, usually supposed to be the Scythians, whilst the last four verses of the chapter are a description of the prophet's mission as that of an assayer of silver, whose business it is to test Judah and see whether there is any of the pure metal left in her. Here there is no concluding phrase at the end of ver. 26, and no introductory one at the beginning of ver. 27, but there can be no doubt as to the original independence of the two oracles.

The third test is a metrical one. The study of metrics is still in its earlier stages, and attention has naturally been turned to the "poetical books" rather than to the prophets. Yet it may well be that, in spite of innumerable dislocations due to mutilation and other faults in transcription, the prophetic books will yield a real light on the subject. Already some features of the subject are clear. There are three, possibly four, main types of rhythm found in the prophetic books. These are the tetrameter (?), the pentameter, the hexameter and the heptameter. The first is perhaps a little uncertain, and possibly ought not to be distinguished from the pentameter, for a reason which will shortly appear. Yet there are poems in the prophets, such as Isaiah i. 4–6, which may be the pure tetrameter. If there is a distinction between the two, it will lie in the dominant character of the parallelism. In the pentameter it is the two halves of the line which correspond with one another, in the tetrameter one whole line usually balances the next. The pentameter takes two main forms. It normally consists of a five-beat line, always with a cæsura in the middle. But this is frequently, though irregularly, varied with a four-beat line, though the number of the five-beat is almost always larger than that of the other. In the five-beat line the position of the cæsura varies. Usually it comes after the third beat, but occasionally after the second. The pentameter (which may perhaps more accurately be called the Qinah) has thus three forms, 3 : 2, 2 : 3, and 2 : 2.

The hexameter also has three forms. It is built up on a basis of triplication from the original two-beat foundation. This triplication appears in two ways, either each of the dimeter members receives a third beat, forming a 3 : 3 line, or a third whole dimeter stichos is added, giving the formula 2 : 2 : 2. These two interchange with great freedom in the

hexameter oracles in the prophets, and there is also another variation, in which a third trimeter stichos is added, producing 3 : 3 : 3, or even, in a few cases, 2 : 2 : 2 : 3.

The remaining type of rhythm is the heptameter. This is very rare in the prophets. Three instances occur in the book of Jeremiah, and though two of these are probably not to be attributed to the prophet at all, the third is one of the most striking pieces of oracular poetry that we have. This is iv. 23–26. The rhythm is properly a 4 : 3, but within the first line there appears a minor cæsura, so that it almost seems to be 2 : 2 : 3.

These three forms of rhythm—since the tetrameter may be only a variant of the Qinah—never interchange in the same oracle. Therefore if, after reading a passage which one finds to be in the Qinah, one suddenly strikes the slower and more balanced hexameter, or *vice versa*, one knows that one has either to assume textual corruption, or that one has passed into a new oracle. An illustration may be found in Jeremiah xlvi. This chapter is usually treated as an oracle concerned with the fate of Egypt especially at the battle of Carchemish. But it contains several oracles, of which some may quite fairly be attributed to Jeremiah himself. Vers. 3–6 are clearly in Qinah, and then with ver. 7 the rhythm changes to 3 : 3, a scheme which persists (when the text is corrected by the LXX) down to ver. 12. The subject of both is the same, and there are no words to show the beginning and end of the oracles. But the change of the metre shows that a new one begins with ver. 7, and one sees at once what a suitable introduction is offered by the words מי זה כיאור יעלה. A recognition of the critical facts of this and the succeeding chapters would have saved Duhm and other commentators many difficulties and errors.

With these three criteria in mind, it is not a difficult task to isolate the various oracles of which our prophetic books

are in large measure composed. We are now in a position to follow the history of their combination into book form.

On looking at a book like that of the prophet Isaiah, one sees at once that it falls into sections, each one of which has a certain self-consistency, and is introduced by a special heading or title. It is a normal and justifiable assumption that each of these once formed a small collection of oracles which were supposed to be the work of the prophet whose name stands at the head of the book. In some cases the oracular matter is mixed with historical or other types of material. This represents a definite stage in the work of compilation, and in a simply constructed book like Isaiah one can see that the main compiler has simply placed these side by side, titles and all. He has included a certain amount of historical material as well, but has placed this at the end, confining his notices of contemporary events to short phrases in the titles. Probably he found them there already when he set about his task.

In Jeremiah there has been a similar process, but it has been a good deal more complicated. There is a much smaller proportion of oracular matter than in Isaiah. Probably half the book is no longer in the oracular poetical form, but in prose. But even in the sections that are now in prose there are distinctions. Many passages speak of Jeremiah in the third person, and form something like a biography of the prophet. These are generally attributed to Baruch, but if they are to be assigned to him or to any one author, it must be recognised that there were several larger divisions in the whole, either as separate "chapters" or as independent booklets. At the same time, the probability is that when these passages came into the hands of the main compiler of the book, they formed a single volume. But they are very far from exhausting the sections which are in prose. There are numerous others which speak of the

prophet in the first person and not the third. It is the merit of Erbt to have been the first to notice that these could not be treated in the same way as the others, but must be held to come from a different compilation. That they are distinct is obvious from the fact that the same event may be described in two sections, one of which alludes to the prophet in the third person, the other in the first. Such a parallel appears in chaps. vii. and xxvi. These three types, then, are distributed as follows throughout the book :—

Oracular	Autobiographical	Biographical
i. 15–iii. 5	i. 1–14	xix. 1–xx. 6
iii. 19–vi. 30	iii. 6–18	xxi. 1–10
viii. 4–x. 25	vii. 1–viii. 3	xxv. 1–15
xi. 15–xii. 17	xi. 1–14	xxvi.
xiii. 15–xvii. 18	xiii. 1–14	xxix.
xviii. 13–23	xviii. 1–12	xxx. 1–3
xx. 7–18	xxiv.	xxxiii.
xxi. 11–xxiii. 40	xxv. 16–29	xxxiv.
xxv. 30–36	xxvii., xxviii.	xxxvi.–xlv.
xxx. 4–xxxi. 40	xxxii.	
xlvi.–xlix.	xxxv.	
l.–li. (?)		lii. (?)

Chapters l. and li. are so freely recognised as a later appendix to the collection of the oracles on the nations that they are hardly worth considering in connexion with the book at all, and a similar remark applies with even more cogency to lii.

It may be not unfairly suggested that these groups of oracular matter represent the minor collections out of which the book was compiled. Each of them, of course, had its own compiler. The methods of these compilers are of the greatest interest. It may be assumed that each of them included in his little book all that he could find which he believed came from the prophet whose work he was col lecting. He may in some cases have had indications in or

about the oracles which led him to place them in something like a chronological order, but it is clear that more often his criteria were of a different kind. Especially interesting is the use of what we may call "catchwords." A compiler, finding that at the end of one oracle or the beginning of another the same or a similar phrase occurred, would place them side by side, though in character and origin they might have little in common. An admirable instance occurs in the case of the two oracles Isaiah i. 4–9 and 10–37. The first of these is a lament over the desolation wrought in Judah by an invader, the second is a denunciation of her sins. The first is in almost pure tetrameter, the second in almost pure Qinah. The only connexion between them is that at the end of the first and the beginning of the second Sodom and Gomorrah are mentioned. A case seems to appear in Jeremiah v. 26 and 27. In spite of the obscurities and corruptions of the text of verse 26, it seems to be clear that both verses were concerned with birds and originally they had no connexion with one another.

We turn to another phenomenon, common to many of the prophets. There are at different points throughout the book headings or titles which divide the whole into smaller sections. These headings must next be considered. They occur in the following places, and one or two which are not found in the LXX are included in brackets: i., [ii.], iii. 6, [vii.], xi., xiv., xviii., xxi., xxv., xxvi., [xxvii.], xxix., xxx., xxxii., xxxiii., xxxiv. 1, xxxiv. 8, xxxv., xxxvi., xl., xliv., xlv., xlvi., [xlvii.], l. We may accept the reading of the LXX in the case of chapters ii. and xlvii., and then two facts emerge. One is that these titles stand at points where the type of passage changes. Thus chapter vi. ends with an oracular section; chapter vii. begins with an autobiographical one. So with the titles at iii. 6, xi. 1, xviii. 1, xxxii. 1. In others the change is from the oracular to the biographical.

So xxi. 1, xxvi. 1. Sometimes it is from the autobiographical to the biographical, as in the case of xxv. 1, xxix. 1, xxxiii. 1, xxxvi. 1. Sometimes the order is reversed, and the heading stands between a biographical and an autobiographical passage. So xxvii. 1 and xxxv. 1. In the case of xlvi. 1 the title stands at the head of the group of the oracles over the nations, and immediately follows a long series of biographical sections. Of the rest, with the exception of xiv. 1, the titles all stand between passages of a biographical character. xxx. 1 is clearly intended to be the opening of a little booklet inside the larger collection, concerned with the happy future which still awaits Israel. The remainder—those which stand at xxxiv. 1, xxxiv. 8, xl. 1, xliv. 1, xlv. 1—occur within the main groups of biographical passages.

These latter have the appearance of being written with a certain continuity, and one argument in favour of the view that Baruch is their writer is to be seen in the fact that only one of them, namely, xxvi., can be safely dated before the occasion when Baruch wrote the oracles of Jeremiah at the prophet's dictation. Even xxvi. can only refer to events which took place two or three years before the writing of the prophecies, and some time before that happened the scribe must have been attached to the prophet. The positions which the different headings hold suggest that the book was divided into chapters or sections according to the periods in Jeremiah's life which were being described. There has been a certain amount of dislocation by the main compiler for his own purposes. Thus xix. ff. is undated, and was possibly the continuation of some narrative either not preserved or preserved in another and later section. It probably owes its present position to the fact that chapter xviii., which is more in place in this portion of the book, also deals with crockery. In that case we have another

illustration of the force of the "catchword." It will be noted that xix. has no heading. Chapter xxi. 1–10 comes from the days of the last siege of Jerusalem, and may have stood at the beginning of xxxviii. Indeed, xxi. 8-10 may well be another form of xxxviii. 2, or we may have there a case of that repetition which was so common in the prose style of the end of the seventh century. Chapter xxix. clearly belongs to the reign of Zedekiah, and probably to the earlier part of it; xxx. 1–3 is difficult to place, though it possibly comes from the sections which deal either with the siege or with the months that followed the destruction of Jerusalem. They may have stood after xxxiii. 13 (verses 14–32 can hardly be regarded as belonging to the book of Jeremiah proper). It probably owes its present position to its very hopeful tone, which accords with that of xxxii. The two "chapters" which occur in xxxiv. certainly come from the reign of Zedekiah, and particularly from the time of the siege. These, as well as xxix., may have stood before xxxvii. 3. There is certainly room for a great deal between xxxvii. 2 and 3, and it is not impossible that verses 1 and 2 are a later substitute for an opening passage which had been lost or removed to another context. From xxxvi. onwards the narratives move in chronological order. If there is any correctness in the suggestion just made as to the opening of xxxvii., then there will have been a fresh heading at this point also. If not, it may be held that chapters xxxvi.–xxxix. form a chapter or a booklet describing Jeremiah's fortunes in Jerusalem. Chapter xl. takes him to Mizpah, and as it may be held to begin a fresh section of his life there is a new heading. This and the following chapters tell the story of the flight to Egypt, and chapter xliv., again with a new title, tells of what he did and said there. Chapter xlv. is more or less of an afterthought, and stands apart from the rest of the book.

We are thus confirmed in our general impression that there was a book in prose which formed a skeleton biography of Jeremiah, or rather narrated incidents in his life from the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim onwards. It was nearly in chronological order, arranged in chapters which dealt with different periods in the later life of the prophet. For his own purposes the compiler dislocated this to some extent, and inserted some of the sections much earlier than they came in the document which lay before him in the first instance.

To see what that purpose was, it is necessary to take into account the second fact which emerges from a comparison between the list of types of writing and the list of the headings. Not only do the headings occur normally when there is a change of the type, but nearly every such change is introduced by a heading, at least when the change is from an oracular to a prose passage. This is, in fact, true in every case except after the end of chapters xii. and xviii. That is to say that, as the book now stands, the various divisions into which it is cut by the headings nearly always begin with a prose passage and end with oracular matter. On the analogy of the Book of Isaiah we are entitled to assume that each of these oracle groups was originally independent, and formed part of the material which the main compiler found to his hand. The same remark, however, will hardly apply to the autobiographical passages, which appear to have formed a more or less continuous whole of the same type as the biographical ones. Thus they begin with the call of the prophet, and the next extract is from the reign of Josiah (iii. 6). vii. 1, it is true must be dated after xi. 1, but similar dislocations have appeared in the case of the biography. xiii. 1–14 has no date, and may have come from any period in the life of the prophet except the earliest or the latest. There is no reason why it should

not have followed more or less closely on viii. 4. The passage in chapter xviii. is also without indication of date or circumstance. Chapter xxiv. belongs to the early part of the reign of Zedekiah. xxv. 16–29 is again a case of dislocation, since it comes from the year 604. xxvii. f. come from the reign of Zedekiah, xxxii. from the end of the same reign, and xxxv. again from the time of Jehoiakim. There are thus only two clear cases of dislocation. The autobiographical sections begin earlier and end earlier than the biography, since their range is from the call of the prophet down to the end of the siege of Jerusalem.

These phenomena, especially those of the dislocation, are best to be explained by assuming that the alterations from the chronological order were due to the main compiler. He had these three types of passage before him, one consisting of oracles grouped in small collections, one of notes by the prophet himself on points in his own life, again divided into sections by various headings, and one similar one containing biographical notices by another hand. He seems to have used the prose matter as a kind of framework. His preference was for the autobiographical passages. These he employed by placing a section or a portion of a section at the head of each of his oracular groups, wherever he thought that he could find a suitable passage. Where such a passage was not forthcoming from the autobiography, he used similar matter from the biography, and in one case, chapter xiv., where the oracle itself seems to have been dated, he found no prose passage that appealed to him. In two cases he found that there were suitable references in both types, namely, in the collections which stand rather apart from the rest in chapters xxv. and xxx.–xxxiii. The process had involved a certain number of dislocations from the order in which he found the prose documents, and when he came to the end of the oracular matter, the compiler had only one

autobiographical section left. This was chapter xxxv., and he inserted it very soon after coming to the end of the oracular matter. There was left to him now only the biographical portion of his material, and he added that without making any more alterations in the order than were necessitated by the excerpts already employed in the earlier part of the work.

It may well be that allowance must be made for dislocations of the text in the course of transmission. One such dislocation is too large and too obvious to be passed over without mention, inasmuch as we have direct evidence of the fact in one of the two great lines of tradition by which the text was handed down. This is, of course, the case of the oracles on the nations, chapters xlvi. ff. It is not possible to enter on it here, but it may well be that the final explanation of the discrepancy between the Palestinian and the Egyptian texts will be found along the lines suggested in this paper. T. H. Robinson.

JESUS CHRIST AND PRAYER.

In a very true sense these two realities, Jesus and Prayer, define sufficiently for us the fact of Christianity. Jesus is the secret of the Christian religion as a self-accrediting message of Divine grace to the sinful, and Prayer is the vital function of the faith which that message has evoked. In the personality of Christ we are confronted by the great historic Fact in which we behold the index of the Father, as faithfully and unchangeably Redeemer; Prayer, on the other hand, when offered in the light of Jesus, is the all-decisive inward fact, the distinct attitude of human souls, which indicates how far Jesus' revelation has achieved its purpose. He who knows what Jesus and Prayer mean, knows Christianity.

The Christian mind has never been able to avoid a two-fold, or alternating, estimate of Jesus, neither aspect of which it will ever be possible to reduce entirely to terms of the other. In the incipient theology of Asia Minor, and even earlier, in the religious thought of the New Testament, there is discernible a tendency to interpret Christ in two ways which are both true at once: *κατὰ πνεῦμα* and *κατὰ σαρκά*. Or to put it otherwise, in more modern and perhaps more technical language, Jesus has invariably been regarded on the one hand as a revelation of God—a Human Life in whom the Father is perfectly presented—a revelation that appeals for faith, demands the obedience of worship, and in that character is somehow over-against us, as God Himself is. Faith looks outward to Him and directs upon Him its whole power of apprehension, because it finds in Him all that can be called salvation; in this general and naïve sense He has been, always and for every Christian mind, on the Divine side of reality. At present we are not concerned with the varied expression which this fundamental conviction has assumed in the Christological affirmations of the Creeds. These are, and must be, subject to the freely revising power of later generations of the living Church.

But, on the other hand, Jesus has simultaneously and with equal universality been interpreted as our Brother in life and death, our Example and Forerunner in obedient faith—one of ourselves in the deepest sense, with a religious life of His own, for which He is responsible and which forms the core of His personal being. It is notorious that if this aspect of the question has suffered undue neglect in ecclesiastical Christology, the fault does not lie with the New Testament. Not to speak of the Synoptic Gospels, the Epistle to the Hebrews in particular contains daring but veracious words concerning the piety of Jesus, His com-

munion with the Father, His experience of temptation, His prayers and supplications "offered up with strong crying and tears." So that "Jesus Christ and Prayer" is a topic drawn straight out of the facts. Jesus the Believer is as real as Jesus the Revealer.

We cannot, however, contemplate these two aspects of the whole Fact of Christ—His manifestation of God and His communion with God—without perceiving at once that they are vitally related to each other. They are not conjoined by accident. It might indeed be asked whether in scope and meaning they are not precisely co-terminous; whether, that is to say, our proper ground of faith in God is not just Christ's faith in God—this, and nothing else. Have we any other ultimate and sufficient reason for making an essential connexion between our faith in the living God and the personality of Jesus than this, that Jesus first exhibits what faith in the living God can be? Is Jesus' trust the last ground of our trust? Put in this way, the question is not one which I myself could answer in the affirmative, for this reason. It must not be forgotten that, in addition to His religious life, Jesus had a history, a career, and into this career there entered facts or experiences of supreme and permanent revealing significance—the Resurrection, for example—which cannot be accurately described as mere elements of His inner life; they happened to Him. But these two, the subjective and the objective—to use a perhaps overwrought and many-coloured distinction—cannot be separated without a false abstraction which distorts the given data. They are presented to us, in the pages of the New Testament, as a living whole, as forming the reality which we know as "Jesus." But though personally I should feel this difficulty about reducing everything that reveals God to Jesus' faith and prayer, I should yet contend emphatically that the two, the inward life and the career,

are strictly organic to each other and are intelligible only as one casts light upon the other. In the weighty words of Thomas Erskine: "A son may reveal a father in two ways: either by being like him—so entirely in his image as to be justified in saying, He that hath seen me hath seen my father—or by manifesting a constant reverential, loving trust, and thus testifying that the father is worthy of such a trust. Jesus revealed the Father in both these ways." He not only stood with God over against men; just as truly He stood with men over against God. And our present interest is to mark that, except for His loving, reverential trust, the revelation of the Father would not have been imparted in moral ways, and could not have been morally appreciated. Revelation, if it is to be more than a verbal, theoretic declaration, must come through an absolute reflection of the Father, caught by and flung out from a perfect soul, in whose depths men should read and love it. That reflection is given specially in Jesus as He prays. There we look into His soul, and find the Father's face mirrored in its depths. His prayer is His faith in movement.

An exhaustive treatment of the theme is not possible here, but we may I think signalise the chief points of interest and moment by considering first Jesus' practice of prayer; next, the convictions underlying His prayer-life: and finally (and more briefly), the tendency which Christians have often shown to pray directly to Jesus. Throughout we shall take the Christological point of view—that is, we shall ask under each head what light is flung upon the personality of Christ, as manifesting the Father.

(1) Jesus' practice of prayer. In this field, as elsewhere, the believer is intuitively aware of both things—Christ's unity with men and His difference from them.

(*a*) In prayer Jesus is one with us. Towards His Father,

it is evident, He felt the same religious awe and humility that befit men: He prayed as we do, and, again like us in our sincere hours, He prayed because of a felt necessity to pray. He bowed reverently before the incomparable majesty of God, bowed with a holy fear that would not use familiarity overmuch. We are accustomed to speak of Jesus as our Pattern, but that great conception we spoil, by vulgarising its appeal, when we permit ourselves to suppose, even though it be half-consciously, that His motive at any point was to furnish an example. Precisely in this matter of prayer, it was His unconscious influence that went deepest. It was when the disciples found Him praying in a certain place that they came with the request: "Lord, teach us to pray." They were moved to the depths by the perception that with Him prayer was engaged in for its own sake, or rather for God's sake. Our Lord's prayer-life is indeed exemplary, but it cannot be too emphatically said that no act is exemplary which is not first of all dutiful and spontaneous. Thus we lay it down as our basal assumption that Jesus prayed in virtue of an inward compulsion, of an irrepressible desire for that communion without which He could not have continued to live.

Christology has fallen into difficulties here—into puzzles, I fear we must say, largely of its own making. Christ on His knees has been felt as disconcerting. Men who occupied the standpoint of a speculative Trinitarianism naturally found it hard to explain how Christ, the Second Person of the Godhead, could pray at all, or how, if He did pray, He could escape praying implicitly to Himself, since His Divine nature, in common with the Father and the Spirit, is being addressed by His manhood. We avoid these enigmas by starting from the Gospel picture. Some questions are unanswerable because they ought never to be asked. We cannot make Christ too human, if His life remains for us a

transparent medium of Divine grace. He kept Himself in the love of God by the only method and through the only experience available for a moral personality, namely, through fellowship and obedience ; or, as we may otherwise express it, through that stedfastly maintained attitude of adoration and receptiveness for which our ordinary name is Prayer. (Prayer, however, not regarded as a movement of spirit ending within itself, but as taking shape in action devoted to the Kingdom of God.) Apart from this uninterrupted vision of the Father, this perpetual acceptance of life at the Father's hands, the activity even of Jesus, however morally noble and aspiring, would religiously have been fruitless.

We cannot now pursue this thought into the details of Jesus' recorded prayers. Suffice it that alike in His more protracted periods of communion and in brief gusts of petition wrung from Him by the exacting needs of ministry, His struggle in the Garden, and the last dark hours on the Cross, He invariably prays under the stress of need. But that need must not be construed in terms of utility. Prayer was not for Jesus a weapon in the struggle for existence. It was no necessary evil, borne resignedly, but the joy and rejoicing of His heart. It was the Son's need to keep unbroken touch with the Father. Nothing brings Him nearer to us than this. As we listen to His prayers, there comes home to us overpoweringly a sense of His experiential oneness with all who have cried to God because God alone was the strength of their heart and their portion for ever.

(*b*) But there is also a distinction between His prayers and ours, and for religion the distinction is as arresting and significant as the identity. The quality of prayer varies with the man. It varies likewise with the vision of God by which it has been evoked and in which it seeks complete satisfaction. It therefore seems to me mere fidelity to the

historic record to affirm that Christ's prayers somehow differed from ours inasmuch as they originated in a uniquely filial consciousness of God which we have good reason to believe dated from early years. They flowed from this filial consciousness, and in turn they nourished it. It is unnecessary on the whole to raise at this point the familiar problem whether the conscious relation of Jesus to the Father was distinct in type from that into which other believers enter, or only distinct in degree. For the contrast of kind and degree is not as helpful as it sounds. If Jesus lived in perfect fellowship with God, while our fellowship is broken and sin-stained, then the difference is one of quality, not quantity, and it is obscured and belittled when terms are used which suggest that Jesus is simply further advanced on the same path by which we are travelling. On the other hand, to speak of a difference of kind is equally misleading, for the fellowship with God He enjoyed unbrokenly is a fellowship into which He bids us follow Him. But a difference of *quality* is obvious. It is indicated clearly, for example, in the extraordinary passage with which the 11th chapter of St. Matthew concludes—that Johannine inset in the Synoptics, as it may be called: "No one knows the Son except the Father; nor does any one know the Father except the Son, and he to whom the Son chooses to reveal Him." These words of overheard soliloquy confirm the impression we gain elsewhere that Jesus had long realised the fact that no one else had a consciousness of, and trust in, the Father at all approaching His own. What is more, this conviction on Jesus' part has been endorsed by the Christian mind from the beginning, in this decisive sense that no Christian has ever professed to have the same consciousness of God as Jesus—a consciousness exhibiting the same intimacy, insight or reciprocity. To repeat His sense of God we should have to *be* Jesus over again. But it

was from this uniquely qualified consciousness that all His prayers took their rise ; to this they gave living expression ; by means of such prayer this singular consciousness of the Father was maintained and perpetuated. Hence we cannot ignore the distinction of Jesus' prayers from ours ; prayer, like every moral act, is only as the agent is. It is in reality the same point which many writers have emphasised by calling attention to the absence of penitence from Jesus' devotional language. And the question whether Jesus felt guilty or unworthy in the Father's presence is, one feels, already decided by the fact that it could become a subject of dispute. Unless in this reference He were not only separate from sinners, but distinct from the saints, His awareness of sin would assuredly have been expressed, not in uncertain whispers, but in piercing and overwhelming sorrow ; we should not have been suffered to remain in doubt whether He was or was not a penitent. Had Jesus possessed experimental knowledge of moral evil, through a bad conscience, we should have known it without fail ; or rather we should not have known it, for His name would have perished, and Christian religion would have had no existence.

Jesus was the first in all history to pray thus. Never before had there risen up to God the prayer of perfect sonship ; and if, as I have explained, there is a true sense in which He was not the last to offer this new type of prayer, appropriate to the Kingdom of God, yet He still remains unique in the new order, for all the rest have learnt of Him. Not only so, but no pupil has equalled the Master. Thus unity and difference, as between Jesus and ourselves, persists to the end. It is only by virtue of His unapproachable pre-eminence that He creates our derivative and imitative experience of prayer.

(2) The convictions which underlie Jesus' prayer-life

must now be ascertained. We have to discover Jesus' view of the universe as a whole, in its fundamental and determining characteristics—a world-view partly implicit in His conduct, but also largely explicit in His teaching. Two great thoughts emerge and ask for study.

First, Jesus' conception of Prayer and its significance is but a special aspect of His conception of the Father. Once in a great hour of exaltation He uttered the words: "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth"; and within the limits of that invocation we shall find the thought of God upon which all Jesus' teaching on Prayer is built. God is Father: not only so, He is Lord of heaven and earth. Neither side of the great fact must be overlooked. Holy Love, reflected in Jesus' life of sonship, defines for us the sense in which we are to understand "Father"; but Holy Love alone and by itself is not what the Christian means by God; and, what is more important, it is not what Jesus meant. The Father is transcendent, infinite with an infinitude for which nothing is impossible, and as Titius remarks, "One cannot make an unprejudiced examination of the Gospels without being astonished to find how enormously important for Jesus' view of God was His impression of God's omnipotence and infinite sublimity." Far from impairing the Jewish belief on that head, He intensified and deepened it to the uttermost. Nature, in contrast to the Father's power, is nothing. The glorious thought of that Lord of heaven and earth who is never weary, and who takes up the isles as a very little thing—the thought which had dilated the mind of the great prophet of the exile—was thus absolutely purified and proclaimed in what, for the religious consciousness, are final and irreducible terms.

In great measure the modern mind has lost the key to this. The world of matter and its laws has separated us from the Father; we are caged and confined by rigidities

of uniformity, and men look out through the bars—not seldom men who love prayer—and talk as though it were happier to be inside the cage than outside. It is occasionally suggested that Jesus thought as He did only because "He was still untouched by our modern knowledge according to which the whole course of nature is controlled by calculable laws." It is assumed that modern conceptions, had He been aware of them, would have changed His faith. But this is unbelievable. What was primary with Jesus was not a world-view, which is perpetually liable to revision, but assurance of the living God, which can never change. Alike in life and prayer He was free in soul, and He was free precisely because of His unshaken certainty that God is free. As Professor Cairns has said in familiar words, which have brought light to many minds: "For the first time in history there appeared on earth One who absolutely trusted the Unseen, who had utter confidence that Love was at the heart of all things, utter confidence also in the Absolute Power of that Absolute Love and in the liberty of that Love to help Him." We speak in the sense of Jesus, therefore, when we place behind His prayers the conviction of an omnipotent Father freely wielding all that is meant by Nature for the realisation of unspeakably gracious ends; a Father to trust whom renders the notion of the cosmos as a closed system of effects and causes sheerly untenable. This in no sense relieves us of the difficult intellectual problem of how the liberty of God is to be exhibited as reconcilable with the order of the world, a problem, it may well be, which we shall never completely solve. But a man's deepest convictions are his religious convictions, and at the basis of Jesus' prayer-life there lies the insight that the Father's freedom is unhampered, that it is determined exclusively by spiritual principles, and that the constitution of the world is not at variance with its loving sway.

The second assumption underlying Jesus' practice and thought of Prayer is a new view of Faith. "Have faith in God," He enjoins. Man's distrust of the infinite Father is the one thing which can prevent the bestowal of God's highest gifts. Submissive confidence sets free the almightiness of Divine Love. God finds a joy in responding to childlike trust by releasing into the phenomenal order the pent-up forces of His goodness in answer to a faith that relies on the Unseen, exactly as we rely on the Seen, to behave in uniform modes: and Jesus' express teaching is to the effect that if we thus unreservedly depend on God, things as great and difficult will happen as the removal of mountains. I need not now dwell on spiritual reasons why God can only give us the highest aids when we come with empty hands and expectant trust, why He has here left Himself dependent on our faith as at other points in life He has upon our devoted co-operation. That is a familiar theme. But at all events it is obvious that this great new sense of Faith, which we owe to Jesus, and which has oozed out of the Christian mind equally with His thought of God, has suffered obscuration chiefly by the intellectualistic conception of Faith which overran the Church in the early centuries, virtually equating Faith with the acceptance of orthodox belief.

It may be pointed out here that there is nothing in Jesus' mind at all corresponding to certain sincere but hesitating distinctions which later thought admitted, and which are still widely prevalent. He gives no countenance to the view that Prayer ought to exclude petitionary elements, as but a relic of primitive magic. His thought was this: when we pray, we offer desires to God in the well-grounded belief that thereby some things will happen which would not have happened had we refrained from prayer. Also He prayed for physical alterations of the world no less trustfully

than for other kinds; that is the childlike thing to do. Anything else is sophisticated: and in point of fact the philosophy which forbids it is equally fatal to prayer for inward grace. Superstition is completely excluded by the circumstance that in both cases, if we follow Jesus, we conclude prayer with an unfailing "Thy will be done."

But to take a step forward—these two fundamental thoughts of Jesus, concerning the Almighty Father and human Faith, do not simply co-exist in otiose juxtaposition. If sin prevails, some kind of mutual exclusion there must be between God and man, except on terms which would construe our experience of sinning as a direct personal experience of God Himself. But if, as in Jesus, sin be absent, and if His prayers are actually the prayers of perfect faith, then instantly the case of Jesus becomes the ideal limit to which our minds ought to ascend from the highest instances of human devotion. It has rightly been contended by a recent essayist that prayer, everywhere and always, is essentially an act of co-operation with the Spirit of God, and that the prayers of Jesus constitute the point at which the Spirit's operation within the praying mind of man reached its highest expression, so that in and through His petitions the operations of God within went out to meet the operation of God in the world. Thus, if Christ is the one commanding instance of prayer completely equal to its idea, what we are dealing with is but another form or aspect of the truth that in Him there was a special presence of God. If no prayer of Jesus was left unanswered—whatever may have been the case with instantly quelled wishes—this must have resulted from, or been an illustration of, the principle that prayer is invariably effectual, effectual without drawback, when the praying spirit is completely in harmony with God. He who shared God's life was in prayer not merely eliciting but actually expressing God's

mind. The Spirit that dwells within us in part dwelt in Him in fullness. One true way of conceiving Christ, accordingly, is to conceive Him as the limiting instance of the immanence of the Spirit of the unseen God, the same Spirit that helps our infirmity when we pray. Here again it is doubtfully illuminating to call this difference blankly one either of kind or degree. But a difference of quality is unmistakable, and one which can never be superseded; for the Spirit's presence in Christ was creative and originative as contrasted with an experience on our part which is unconditionally derived. This difference, as we have seen, is strikingly manifest in the field of Prayer. In our thoughts of this whole subject we must never start with ready-made conceptions of what Prayer is: we have in Jesus' prayer a new standard of comparison, as it is through Him that we receive the Spirit that makes possible for us such prayer as His.

Possibly the last thing worth saying under this head is that for Jesus prayer is charged with power to effect real changes. It is meant to have an answer. People who came to Him and would take no denial refreshed His spirit in a wonderful and most significant fashion. The recent flood of fertilising eschatological study ought not to hide from us the fact that in His belief prayer can hasten the coming of the Kingdom: by the touch of faith men can liberate the gracious energies of the Father. God is living and waits to act. How we Protestants need to recover this sense of the present and transcendent activity of the Father, and how profoundly such a rediscovery of the living God would transform our prayers! Dean Church somewhere explains Newman's choice of the Roman communion by the fact that Newman "could not see a trace in English society of that simple and severe hold of the unseen which is the colour and breath, as well as the outward form, of the New

Testament life." To go on our knees to what, with a specious simplicity, is misdescribed as the modern view of the world (as if there were only one), tamely to surrender Jesus' thought of God, His thought of Faith, His thought of Prayer as uniting these two in living and redeeming unity, is a far more definite apostasy from the fundamental truth of the Christian Gospel than heresies against which we are cautioned much more frequently. I am persuaded, however, that it is apostasy which no Christian mind ever commits in innermost conviction, whatever wild and whirling words may be resorted to in technical discussion.

(3) A few concluding words may be added on the subject of Prayer to Christ. We must speak briefly, for here we are no longer treating of the substantialities of history, but rather with what may be designated the natural, and even legitimate though not obligatory, speculation of faith. It must not be supposed that the practice of addressing Christ in prayer is obsolete, or that it obtains solely in definitely conservative circles. On the contrary, I understand that Professor Martin Rade, a very attractive member of the Ritschlian school, and a thinker of pronouncedly liberal sympathies, not long since declared that nothing would ever induce him to discontinue the custom of praying to Christ directly—a custom, he added, in which faith itself encouraged him. Be his attitude right or wrong, at least there are well-known precedents for it in New Testament religion, while the most cursory glance over ancient and modern Liturgies proves to demonstration that the habit has never been unfamiliar to the Church.

One interpretation of the practice may well be disallowed at the very outset. It is not a valid defence of prayer to Christ to argue that He is, as it were, one of the glorified saints, pre-eminent it is true, yet not in a class by Himself. In Dr. George Adam Smith's Life of Henry Drummond a

correspondent is quoted who testifies that after Drummond's death he sometimes prayed to him. That is a touching fact, intelligible to many, but it is no true parallel to Christian prayer addressed to the Christian's Lord. It lacks the religious presuppositions of the other.

Again, prayer to Christ is clearly wrong if it forms an alternative to, or substitute for, prayer to God. Unquestionably, it has often figured thus in the religious life. People have contracted the lamentable habit of regarding Christ as more accessible than the Father, more loving, more easy to be entreated, and they have taken their desires chiefly or exclusively to Him, as others to the Virgin, shirking contact with the supposedly sterner God. But this can have no place in a faith inspired by the New Testament.

Premising that in regard to this form of prayer there exists a curious cross-division of opinion, some conservatives rejecting it, some liberals approving it—I venture to think there are two points of view from which it appears as permissibly Christian, and natural in the best sense. First, the great reality apprehended by faith is God in Christ. Not certainly Christ apart from God, yet quite as certainly not God apart from Christ. "Apart from Christ," said Chalmers, "I find that I have no hold of God at all." The supreme object of confidence, therefore the true object of supplication and communion, is the Father revealed in the Son. But this reality may be grasped, so to say, from either side; it may be apprehended either in its proximate or its ultimate aspect. It may be seized in that aspect of it which is closer to our minds, the revealing Personality; or again in that aspect which fills and gives meaning to manifested fact, the revealed God. In both cases the reality is the same. And he who prays to Christ will say, not erroneously as I think, that he does no more than name this

reality in terms of historic fact. In strictness, when he says Christ, what is in his mind is the God who draws near in Christ, and with whom, in experience, Christ is identified.

Furthermore, if the conception of the exalted Christ has any place in the believing mind—if it is not a piece of pure mythology—then it is difficult to conceive of the glorified Lord save in forms which virtually identify Him with God and thus make prayer to Him—this time not in view of the historical revelation merely but in face of present certainties—an instinctive movement of adoration. To believe only that Christ was immortal, like other men, but not that He now lives in the fullest possession of blessedness and power, appears to me radically unjust to the implications of faith as that faith has fought and conquered from the beginning until now. This, however, means that if a man prays to Christ, he only does so rightly, as Herrmann puts it, in so far as "at the moment of prayer every difference between the Person of Jesus and the one personal God is done away."

What has just been said is but a defence of the legitimacy of such prayer in Christian devotion, certain conditions being fulfilled. None will maintain that it is a necessary or vital expression of saving trust. We are learning by degrees that Christian experience admits a variety of religious types, and that these types have each its congenial way of reacting upon the Gospel.

When we contemplate Jesus' thought of Prayer as a whole, under the strong light of His personal religion, we are forced back upon very searching questions about the theology and the Church life of our age. It is clear that we are not utterly believing. We have sunk into a species of Christian naturalism, which in certain cases is prepared to formulate exactly the laws of historical periodicity by which the Kingdom of God goes forward in one age and backward in the next. But this is to be spectators of the

great Divine movement, not fellow-labourers in it with God, as we may be through Prayer. It is to breathe an atmosphere far removed from Jesus' conception of God, the All-loving, the All-powerful, the All-free. And it is as we triumphantly and adoringly recapture His thought of the Father that His kindred thought of Prayer will again possess us, and His Church will again be made adequate to the stupendous task of missionary evangelism and social reclamation.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

CAN FAITH BE INDIFFERENT TO THE BODILY RESURRECTION OF OUR LORD?

SOME years ago Dr. Sanday in his pamphlet entitled *Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism* (1914) professed willingness for the sake of recommending Christianity to "the cultivated modern man," and removing "the greatest of all stumblingblocks to the modern mind," to treat the question of the bodily Resurrection of our Lord as unessential for Christian faith. It was sufficient, he thought, to assent to the spiritual truth of the doctrine of the Resurrection without committing ourselves to a definite attitude to the alleged physical fact. The explicit avowal of this position, though Dr. Sanday confessed his mind had been gravitating towards it for some time,[1] was made by way of reply to the Bishop of Oxford's open letter to his clergy on "The Basis of Anglican Fellowship," in which it was urged that the Church through its bishops should repudiate those of its teachers and clergy who reject as historical facts the traditional doctrines of the Virgin Birth and the Bodily Resurrection.

[1] See his *Life of Christ in Recent Research* (1907), pp. 3–34, and *Christologies Ancient and Modern* (1910), pp. 221–239. Cf. his recently published *Divine Overruling*, Lect. III, "On the Nature of Miracle."

The controversy which has ensued within the Church of England has turned round the question whether the clauses in the Apostles' Creed affirming the miraculous Birth and the Resurrection of our Lord on the third day, may be or ought to be interpreted in a literal or only in a symbolical sense as imaginative or figurative expressions of spiritual truth. That certain articles of the Creed—those referring to the Descent into Hades, the Ascension and Session at the right hand of God—are to be so interpreted, not as statements of literal historical fact, but as presenting spiritual truth in a parabolic or figurative form—this is now generally recognised. Does the same apply to the Virgin Birth and the Bodily Resurrection? In regard to the former Sanday says, referring to the Gospel account of the Birth:

"This is just a case where I think that the Gospels use symbolical language. I can endorse entirely the substantial meaning of that verse of St. Luke (i. 35): 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God.' This is deeply metaphorical and symbolical, and carries us into regions where thought is baffled. I do not doubt that the Birth of our Lord was sanctified in every physical respect in the most perfect manner conceivable. The coming of the Only-begotten into the world could not but be attended by every circumstance of holiness. Whatever the Virgin Birth can spiritually mean for us is guaranteed by the fact that the Holy Babe was Divine. Is it not enough to affirm this with all our heart and soul, and be silent as to anything beyond?" (pp. 19–20).

Belief in the Supernatural Birth of our Lord, in other words in the Incarnation, Dr. Sanday emphatically asserts; but that this Supernatural Birth or Incarnation involved a physical miracle he finds difficulty in believing, inasmuch

as this would be, he thinks, to make it "unnatural" (p. 19). In like manner with regard to the Resurrection he is of the opinion that we ought to be satisfied with a heartfelt expression of the conviction that the Risen Lord as Spirit still governs and inspires His Church while sitting loose to the question of what became of His body:

"The central meaning of the Resurrection is just that expressed in the vision of the Apocalypse: 'I am the first and the last and the Living one; and I was dead and behold I am alive for ever more' (Rev. i. 18). Is it not enough for us that the first disciples were convinced of this by signs which they could understand, by signs appropriate to the world of ideas in which they moved? So much is quite certain: and so much agrees perfectly with the whole sequel of events which follow. That the Risen Lord as Spirit still governed and inspired His Church is proved beyond question, if by nothing else, by the first-hand testimony of St. Paul—not only by his own experience but by the experience of the Christian Church around him. All this, I repeat, is verifiable history. But we may go on disputing forever as to the exact mode in which the Resurrection of our Lord was accomplished, as we shall never know the exact manner of our own resurrection" (pp. 20–21).

This, Dr. Sanday believes, is "all that the Church's faith (in the Resurrection) has stood for" (p. 28); this at least is "the central reality" (*ib.*) of the doctrine, its religious value, and all that it is of the essence of faith to hold.

With the controversy thus raised in the Church of England and the course of its development we are not here concerned. Bethune-Baker's *The Miracle of Christianity* and *The Faith of the Apostles' Creed, Faith or Fear? An appeal to the Church of England* (Matthews and others), Glazebrook's *The Faith of a Modern Churchman*, and *The Letter and the Spirit*, F. H. Chase's *The Meaning of the Creed*, and *Belief*

and Creed, and C. W. Emmet's *Conscience, Creeds and Critics* are some of the products of the controversy. The central question at issue, so far as it refers to the Resurrection, with which alone we are here concerned, is this: Can faith be indifferent to the Bodily Resurrection? Can it afford to sit loose to the question as to what became of our Lord's body after death? Is belief in the bodily resurrection of our Lord not vital or essential to the Christian faith in the sense that indifference to the belief affects detrimentally our whole outlook on the world and giving us a 'reduced' or 'attenuated' Christianity and depriving the traditional doctrine of the Resurrection of its full religious value for Christian thought?

That the belief in the Empty Tomb and the Bodily Resurrection was an essential part of the first disciples' faith is acknowledged by those who adopt the position in question. If the body of Jesus had been left in the grave and seen corruption no belief in the Resurrection on the part of the disciples, it is recognised, could have been created. To them as Jews—so Sanday represents the case—a Resurrection without an empty grave was unthinkable. It was not only that the faith in their Master which had been shattered by the cross could not have been re-established and reconstructed without it. It was that for them with "minds steeped in the Old Testament," and thoughts which "naturally ran into the moulds which the Old Testament supplied" (*ib.* p. 24), with the tendency in a primitive and pre-scientific age to surround great personalities with a mythical or legendary halo of miracle, the miracle of the Bodily Resurrection "seemed necessary to the completeness of the idea" (p. 27). Necessary thus to the first disciples, it is for us to-day, however—such is the contention—necessary "no longer" (p. 27). Needful for the re-establishing of the faith of His first Jewish followers and

thus setting the Church agoing, now that it has been set agoing the miracle of the Bodily Resurrection is no longer a necessary or essential part of the Christian faith and may be dropped without affecting it in any vital way. It "has done its work and can be spared. It is like a lame man laying aside his crutches" (p. 28). Faith, it is said, is to be exercised in a Living Exalted Lord and of this faith belief in the Resurrection of the Body laid in Joseph's tomb is no vital part. In Harnack's earlier mode of statement,[1] for us to-day the "Easter faith," the "conviction that the Crucified One gained a victory over death, and that He who is the firstborn among many brethren still lives," is independent of the "Easter message" of the empty grave and the subsequent appearings of the Risen Jesus. The spiritual doctrine of the Resurrection, "the essential Gospel of the Resurrection," as the writer of the *Fifth Gospel* expresses it (p. 166), is to be distinguished from the physical miracle with which it has been traditionally so closely connected.

The resemblance of this position to that of writers of the Ritschlian School on the same subject will at once occur to the mind. Only the interest in which it is put forward in the two cases is different. Ritschlian writers, or the main section of them, advocate the position in the interest of making faith independent of historical criticism and of the uncertainties of historical enquiry. They minimise the historical element in the Christian religion on the ground that events which happened in the past are an unstable foundation for faith, leaving it always exposed to fresh doubts from the side of historical investigation. As Herrmann expresses it: "the basis of faith must be something fixed; the results of historical study are continually changing."[2] Sanday and those who agree with him

[1] *What is Christianity?* (3rd edn.), p. 163 f.

[2] *Communion of the Christian with God* (2nd edn.), p. 76.

advance the position rather in an apologetic interest, viz. from the point of view of accommodating and commending Christianity to modern thought, by removing what he calls "the greatest of all stumblingblocks to the modern mind" (*ut sup.* p. 30) in the way of its acceptance, the admission of miracle in the physical realm.

Now with reference to this position we propose to ask the following questions: *First*, Is it possible to rest in the distinction referred to and make faith to-day indifferent to the historical fact of the Bodily Resurrection? *Second*, In view of the significance for Apostolic thought of the resurrection of the body of Jesus is the validity of such a position probable? And *third*, Is it necessary for the sake of recommending Christianity to the modern mind thus to disparage the physical fact? Before asking these questions, however, we wish to point out that the doctrines of the Virgin Birth and of the Bodily Resurrection of our Lord are not on the same level or in the same category for Christian faith. The two beliefs do not hold the same relation to faith, they are not equally fundamental or central. Faith in the Incarnation is not necessarily connected with any particular theory as to the mode or manner of Jesus' coming into the world. Indeed it is possible to hold, as many of those do who call in question the Virgin Birth, that "the Incarnation means more, is more intelligible and is more in accord with our best conceptions of God, if we believe that the Christ was made like unto His brethren in all things, even in the manner of His birth."[1] At all events it is significant that St. Paul and St. John, not to mention other New Testament writers, formulate their Christology and present their Gospel in entire independence of the doctrine of the miraculous conception. No hint is dropped in their writings that faith

[1] Cf. C. W. Emmet, *Conscience, Creeds and Critics*, p. 60.

in the Incarnation, in Jesus as God manifest in the flesh, depends on or implies belief in a particular mode of His coming into the world. We may maintain, as some do, that belief in the miraculous Birth is of the *bene esse* of the Christian faith in the Incarnation, in the sense that it is altogether congruous or harmonious with the character of His unique life that He should have come into the world in a unique way. But at least it is not of the *esse* of faith. The Gospel was presented from the first without any reference to the belief. Not so, however, with the Bodily Resurrection. From the beginning the Gospel was the Gospel of the Resurrection, and of a Resurrection which was not merely spiritual but physical, presented as relative to the Burial and as the reversal of it.[1] Such a Resurrection is represented not only as the fontal source and origin of faith but also as entering into the very substance of the Christian Gospel. So very different is the evaluation of the two doctrines in the New Testament itself. Now for the questions indicated.

First. Is it possible for faith to rest in the distinction referred to? It is no doubt true that for us to-day, with the evidences before us of Christ's presence and power in His Church throughout many centuries and with a truer spiritual discernment thereby of the significance of His life and work, faith in a Living Lord may not depend so immediately or so directly as in the case of the first disciples on the historical testimony of the empty grave and the subsequent Appearings. But to make the belief in the Bodily Resurrection of merely temporary significance, necessary to set the Church agoing, while now that it has been set agoing it

[1] There is really no meaning in speaking of a merely spiritual resurrection. As Tertullian pointed out, only that which has fallen down can be said to rise again. "Resurgere non est nisi ejus quod cecidit" (*Adv. Marcionem*, v. 9).

may be cast aside as "no longer necessary," is not this to spurn the ladder by which we have risen to our Christian faith and to leave this faith in the air?

Christian faith is faith in a living Lord, but in what kind of a living Lord? Harnack makes the statement, and in this the supporters of the position under discussion seem to be at one with him, that Christian faith to-day "has nothing to do with the knowledge of the form in which Christ lives, but only with the conviction that He is the living Lord."[1] But if it could be shown that Christ's body had remained in the tomb, or, what comes to the same thing, if there were no satisfactory historical evidence to the contrary, would not this faith be involved in internal contradiction and continually driven back upon itself in questioning whether the conviction were not after all a delusion? The conviction that Jesus is the living Lord, that "He could not be holden of death," may for us to-day be based primarily on an immediate experience of His risen power in our personal life. But this experience comes to us mediated through historical channels, through our relation to the accumulated experience and testimony of the Christian Church, which carries us back ultimately to the apostolic witness contained in the New Testament—a witness based on the facts of the Empty Tomb and the subsequent manifestations of the risen living Lord. These were the facts which as a matter of history were the fontal source and spring of Christianity as the Gospel of the Resurrection. And faith in the Resurrection can never dispense with this

[1] *History of Dogma*, i. 85 f.

One important difference between the Resurrection-body of Christ and that of believers is recognised by the Apostolic writers. In His case the body of earth was not suffered to see corruption, but was transformed into a spiritual body "in such a way" as even Kirsopp Lake acknowledges "that there was no trace left of the corruptible body of flesh and blood which had been laid in the grave" (*Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 20). The significance of this difference is dealt with below (under the *third* question).

its historical fact basis. The attempt to eliminate or discard these facts in the supposed interest of a more scientific or rational Christianity involves a representation of it the identity or continuity of which with the Christianity of history it is difficult to establish, and cuts off Christian faith from the soil in which it grew.

To ascribe to the influence of Jewish sources the form in which the New Testament doctrine of the Resurrection at first took shape is to fail to explain the characteristic difference between the Jewish and Christian conceptions and the utterly novel character of the latter. The Resurrection of our Lord represented in the Gospels is no mere reanimation and resuscitation of the natural Body which was the current Jewish representation of the Resurrection. It was a Resurrection to a new mode of being, and as such a new revelation—a revelation which transformed and revolutionised the whole thought and life of the disciples. But this takes us to our second point.

Second. In view of the significance of the bodily Resurrection of Christ for Apostolic faith is the validity of the distinction referred to probable ?

We have to remember what the significance of the Bodily Resurrection for the Apostles was. It was not simply evidential, an external sign or seal added on to the life and work of Christ on earth to convince the disciples of their Master's survival of death and of the truth of His claims —an evidential appendage which once these convictions were attained could then be dropped without affecting *their* Gospel in any vital way. If this were all, the bodily resurrection of Jesus might be represented as necessary only from the point of view of the first disciples—necessary, especially, in view of the ideas which were natural to them with " minds steeped in the Old Testament."

This view of the Resurrection as mainly evidential is the correlative of that view of the miracles of Jesus, natural to eighteenth century theology, which laid stress on their value as credential appendages rather than as an essential part of Jesus' redemptive revelation. According to the invariable Apostolic representation, however, the bodily resurrection of Christ is not merely something added on to the Life and Work on earth as a reward and guarantee of their efficacy. It is itself an essential and constitutive part of the revelation, necessary to its culmination or completion, and as such of no mere temporary significance, but of value for us to-day in the twentieth century as much as for the first disciples. In virtue of its being no mere reanimation of the body of earth, but the entrance in His risen manhood on a new life of exalted power and Lordship, in which with the virtue of His life and death on earth in Him He exercises His full redemptive activity, the Resurrection of Jesus constitutes a new beginning in the life of humanity, ushering in a new creative epoch. On it and on our relation to a risen exalted Saviour Christian life and experience in all its forms depends. In particular in the Resurrection of Jesus, and in the participation of the body in His triumph over death, we have according to the Apostles at once the guarantee and the ground of the fullness or completeness of the believer's redemption, body as well as spirit being included in the Christian resurrection and in the sphere of Christ's redemptive energy. "Who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of His glory" (Phil. iii. 21). "If the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, He who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will also make your mortal bodies live by His indwelling Spirit in your lives" (Rom. viii. 11).

In the resurrection of Christ, accordingly, with its inclusion

of the body in His victory over death, the Apostles saw the pledge of the supremacy of the spiritual over the material, the guarantee of the ultimate subjugation of the material order to the purposes of spirit, and of the consummation of the Kingdom of God—as we would say to-day of the whole creative evolutionary process—"the summing up of all things in Christ, the things in heaven and the things in earth," and thus the bringing about of final world-unity. And what we have to ask is this? Would faith in a living Christ which did not include the Bodily Resurrection, the participation of the Body in His triumph over death, be adequate to the fullness of such an Apostolic Gospel?

Third. Is such a denial or minimising of the Bodily Resurrection after all necessary for the sake of harmonising Christianity with the supposed requirements of modern thought?

With characteristic candour Dr. Sanday confesses that the chief influence leading him to this position has been not historical criticism proper, not any alleged insufficiency of historical evidence, but certain dogmatic or philosophical considerations—in particular the "*praejudicium* which had been gradually forming itself" (*ut sup.* p. 27) in his mind against the admission of "nature miracles" in Christianity, as involving a "real breach in the order of nature" (p. 24). Miracles of a kind he allows, what he calls "*supra naturam*" miracles, e.g. the healing miracles of the Gospels. These are "abundantly accounted for by the presence in the world of a unique Personality and by that wave of new spiritual force which flowed from it in ever increasing volume" (*ib.*). So far from involving a breach in the order of nature, science is discovering that these are explicable as cases of hitherto unsuspected natural law, instances of what Matthew Arnold called "moral therapeutics." But

the "nature miracles" of the Gospels—chief of which are the Virgin Birth and the bodily resurrection of Jesus—he represents as not thus *supra naturam*, but as "*contra naturam*" and therefore "unnatural" (p. 19) as involving a "definite reversal of the natural physical order" (p. 23). The conception of such 'nature miracles' took its rise, such is the representation, in the region of the Old Testament, through the influence of myths or legends gathering round great personalities in a pre-scientific age, and "perpetuated itself in the New Testament" (p. 27). From our modern standpoint, however, the conception must be "superseded" (*do.*). The admission of such miracles is contrary to the postulate of modern science, that of the uniformity or regularity of nature, and must be dropped. This done, experience becomes all of a piece, "the beautiful regularity that we see around us now" becomes "the law of the Divine action from the beginning to the end of time" (p. 30), and there is brought nearer what Sanday describes as "the ultimate goal," "the unification of thought, the fusion of all secular thinking and all religious thinking in one comprehensive and harmonious system" (p. 31).[1]

At the root of this distinction, however, between miracles *supra naturam* and miracles *contra naturam*, and of the distinction between the spiritual and the bodily Resurrection to which it leads, there lies an abstract separation between the spiritual and the material, between spirit and matter, which is neither good science nor good philosophy—the same separation as is at the basis of the contention that prayer can be concerned only with spiritual and not with material things. It is the offspring of a mechanical view

[1] The words in which Sanday describes the *motif* of this proposed attitude to the Bodily Resurrection bear a striking resemblance to those in which writers of the "religious-historical" school in Germany advance a similar position. See e.g. Bousset's *What is Religion?* (E.T.), Chap. viii.

of nature, that view which represents it as a closed system of natural law shut in upon itself, independent and and self-sufficient. Nature being conceived in this way, miracle is represented as a breaking into the system from the outside, like a burglar breaking into a house.

But such a view of nature is now obsolete and discredited, repudiated by the best scientific "modern thought." Nature is not thus a finished complete system. It is part of a larger spiritual whole by relation to whose ends it is determined and conditioned. In this spiritual whole or process different levels or orders are distinguished as lower and higher, "natural" and "supernatural"—the "supernatural" being relative to what at any particular stage of thought we mean by "nature." From the point of view of the lower levels or orders the higher may seem "unnatural," "*contra naturam*" in the sense of obeying laws which seem to contradict those of the lower level. But this means only that they are contrary to nature so far as yet known; in the words of St. Augustine long ago, they are "non contra naturam, sed contra quam est nota natura" (*de Civ. Dei*, xxi. 8).[1] From the point of view of the mechanical physical order, e.g., the phenomena of organic nature and still more of self-conscious personality will appear as if they contradicted the laws of that order. As some one has put it, "viewed from below *supra* will always look as if it spelt *contra*." It would be *contra*, however, only if the laws of the lower order were assumed to be final and ultimate instead of being part of a larger whole, means to ends beyond themselves. Nature is "uniform" or "regular" only in the sense that if the same conditions are

[1] Sanday himself quotes this saying of St. Augustine in the pamphlet referred to (*Challenge to Criticism*, p. 26). But he applies it to the elucidation of the "healing miracles," not of the "nature miracles." Cf. his *Life of Christ in Recent Research*, pp. 216 ff.

fulfilled the same results will follow. If the conditions are changed, and new forces are introduced whereby a new level of working is brought about, the ordinary laws of nature are not violated or contradicted but rather transcended, their action is controlled or modified for higher ends.

Apply this to Jesus and His bodily resurrection. From the point of view of ordinary human personality, the bodily resurrection of Jesus on "the third day" may appear "unnatural" or "*contra naturam*," contrary to the laws of human nature so far as yet known. But in Jesus, as the Gospel narratives present Him, we have a human personality of a unique kind, unique with a moral and spiritual uniqueness in His character, person and work. He stood in the midst of a sinful world the alone Sinless One, living in perfect communion with God and in perfect love to man. Now human personality is a unity in which spiritual and material are organically connected and mutually interdependent—so connected and interdependent that, as modern scientific knowledge of the mutual relations of spirit and body is increasingly insisting, a moral and spiritual uniqueness carries with it as its proper correlation a physical uniqueness. To argue from our experience of ordinary sinful personality, therefore, and nature's reaction upon it, to what must have happened in the case of a sinless human being is unjustifiable. It may be "contrary to nature" or a violation of our experience of nature's uniformity, in the sense of being contrary to our ordinary experience, that a human body should rise from the dead. But in the case of a sinless personality like that of Jesus we have a fact so transcending ordinary experience that no amount of evidence drawn from such experience can warrant us in laying down beforehand how nature will react on such a one. It may be as normal for a sinless man to rise from

the dead as it is for the bodies of sinful men to remain in the grave. In the case of sinful men, the "redemption of the body" (Rom. viii. 23) may require the laying aside of the material body of earth, the leaving it in the grave to the process of corruption, in order to our being clothed with a "spiritual body," which shall be a fitter organ and instrument of spirit. But in the case of a body such as that of Jesus was, a body unstained by sin and completely dominated by spirit, the natural body may have given place to the spiritual without having to pass through the process of corruption. So far from its being "unnatural" or contrary to nature, our modern scientific knowledge of the mutual interdependence of spirit and body is more and more making it appear altogether natural and *a priori* probable that One who like Jesus was not holden of sin should also not be holden of death.

If this be so, then in the proposed indifference to the bodily resurrection of our Lord we have an attenuating of the Christian faith which not only, as we have seen, fails to do justice to the fullness of Apostolic thought, but represents a compromise with naturalistic thinking which is unscientific and unphilosophical, and therefore quite uncalled for from the point of view of commending Christianity to "the cultivated modern man."

J. M. Shaw.

WILLIAM ROBERTSON SMITH: RECOLLECTIONS OF A FELLOW-STUDENT.

Our interest in reminiscences is a striking illustration of what has been called the law of circularity in human experience. If the sympathy of youth is drawn out towards age, no less does age in turn revert to youth and all the memories that cluster round it. With a pleasure not

unmingled with sadness, we recall our own early days; and, if we have been spared to see others whom we knew and loved passing beneath the horizon while life was yet young, very readily do we recall the time in which we had the privilege of being in close fellowship with them.

Since I have come to find a home in the city where I lived as a student of theology, my early teachers at New College have often passed through the visions of bygone years. One can never forget the great time when one had the privilege of sitting at the feet of teachers like John Duncan and Andrew Bruce Davidson. Yet even above these rises vividly the figure of my early classmate and friend, William Robertson Smith. So keen have my memories of him become that I have ventured to think that not a few readers of the EXPOSITOR might like to have them set down in permanent form. Their appearance at this date may be regarded as the more appropriate that the present year marks the lapse of half a century since Smith stepped into public life as Professor of Hebrew in the Free Church College of Aberdeen. Had he been still living we should have been celebrating "the jubilee" of his professoriate. It is a long period to look back across, but, as Charles Tennyson said of his friend W. H. Brookfield, "we, that is, all old college friends, survive in each other's memories, though circumstances so often keep us apart. Disuse of each other's society (not being voluntary) perhaps intensifies the more the early morning freshness of recollection."

Into the details of Smith's career as a whole I am not to enter. Readers who desire these have only to turn to the admirable biography prepared by our friend, Dr. J. Sutherland Black. I shall endeavour as far as possible to avoid the track he and his collaborator pursued and deal chiefly with incidents that are still clear in my own memory.

In this paper, I shall survey Smith's student days; in a second one, I hope to refer to his work as professor in Aberdeen and his later life in Cambridge.

I.

My first sight of Smith occurred in the quadrangle of King's College in Old Aberdeen at the end of October, 1861. That period marked what was quite a new era in the academic history of Aberdeen. For many a year before there had been an active rivalry betwixt King's College in the old town and Marischal in the new. But under the influence of reformers like Professor David Thomson and the Lord Rector, Sir John Inglis, in King's, the two colleges had become fused in one University in 1860, and students were flocking in great numbers into the classes. This is evident from the fact that not much less than two hundred lads from the various schools in the North of Scotland took part in the competition for bursaries before the session began.

In these later days, it is difficult for southern students to imagine the keen interest which this annual tournament evoked. As Principal Sir W. D. Geddes once said, "The Bursary Competition has long been known to be a very important arena, where there is a confluence of ingenuous youth of all the schools in the northern province. Whether, like the Olympic games, it has a right to take precedence among similar competitions elsewhere is a matter of debate: but no one will deny that it constitutes, if not the Olympic, at all events an important member of the group, and in point of antiquity and the interest with which it has been always regarded, it may put in a claim for this high position." The University of Aberdeen has always been pre-eminent in resources for scholarships; and it is no exaggeration to say that success in the Competition for them was

in many homes in those days regarded as the supreme test amongst young lads of fitness for any of the higher grades of future work.

Who that has gone through the preparation will ever forget the meticulous care with which he had to master not merely English Grammar and Composition, the Latin Grammar and preliminary Mathematics, but Melvin's *Preliminary Dissertations on Latin Composition*, the whole of Geddes' *Greek Grammar* and *Latin Clause Construction* and as much of Crombie's *Latin Gymnasium* as he could hold? The Version or translation of English into Latin had been the *pièce de resistance* for centuries; and in Smith's day it still held this place. In the introduction to a fine collection of materials that had been prescribed for these exercises, Dr. Joseph Ogilvie wrote truly: "If it is necessary to offer any apology for the appearance of the present reprint of these papers, such will be found in the intrinsic value and abiding interest of the compositions themselves. They are so directly associated with the destiny of many an aspiring and talented youth that they must bring with them either the regretful recollection of ambitions frustrated or the pleasing memory of pitfalls escaped and success won at a crisis when success was the sole passport to academic halls."

With a full consciousness of all that this Competition then meant and with the desire to learn by experience what facing it involved, Smith had gone up even in October, 1860, when he was not quite fourteen years of age; but though he did well in "the Order of Merit," his father wisely decided to keep him another winter at home, till, with his younger brother, George, he should be more thoroughly prepared for the work of the classes. Now, however, he had come up again, and amidst a crowd of young lads was eagerly awaiting the moment when from some

upper window opening on the quadrangle, Professor David Thomson, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, should thrust out his head and read aloud the list of successful competitors. On this occasion he received a great shout of welcome and at once said: "Gentlemen, the first Bursary of £30 is awarded to William Robertson Smith of the Free Church Manse of Keig, Aberdeenshire." As the name was not known amongst the champions of the Aberdeen Grammar School or the Gymnasium or any of the larger provincial academies, many of the taller lads looked round about to see if they could discern any face beaming with delight over the announcement. I myself had no difficulty in distinguishing the fortunate scholar: for just at my side there was one who seemed to be only a small boy, wearing a grey Inverness cape and a Scotch bonnet, and, as soon as the name was intimated, he swung his glengarry over his head and cried out in ecstasy: "*Hurrah! I'm First Bursar.*"

I, of course, congratulated the happy boy; and when after a few intervening names my own was called out, he returned the compliment. From that hour we were friends. Smith's younger brother, George, was also in the competition; but probably some slip in a Version set with traps had entailed a heavy loss of marks and he obtained a smaller bursary. The same fate befell one who was to be a formidable rival for distinction, namely, William Minto, afterwards Professor of English Literature and Logic at the University. As soon as the list was finished, Professor Thomson gave a few words of exhortation to those who had been successful, urging them to work worthily in the classes of which they were to be members, and also to those who had only got into "the order of merit," kindly inviting them to return and try another day. Then the large crowd hastily broke up to send tidings of success or failure to anxious friends at home.

I have been the more ready to take some pains in depicting this opening scene in Smith's academic career, that it explains the whole spirit of energy and enthusiasm and hopefulness he displayed in his subsequent work in the University. Though not fifteen years of age till November 8 of that year (1861), he felt that the position he had won as first bursar laid on him a responsibility to go forward to higher things and to show an example of diligence in every class he attended.

One of the most interesting we had in our first year was that of English Language and Literature. It was conducted by Professor Alexander Bain, so widely known even then for his acute contributions to Psychology, and it supplied a valuable discipline for students of every grade. Instead of starting with the History of Literature, Bain gave a course of lectures on English Composition and Rhetoric. Smith valued these highly and had no difficulty in securing the first prize at the end of the session. During the winter, he confined himself very much to the main current of the class work. But I have reason to know that when the long vacation arrived, he read widely in the great English classics of prose and poetry. Macaulay, whose *Lays of Ancient Rome* he had largely by heart, was constantly read for his brilliant Biographical Essays and his reviews of historical events. In reading some of Smith's own *Lectures and Essays*, I have often thought that I observed the influence of Macaulay's finely concatenated paragraphs and even heard the echoes of his well-turned periods. Milton's prose works also had no small part in shaping Smith's style. But he was no less keenly interested in poetry. Like his father, he took delight in the Translations of Dryden and Pope and became very familiar with Tennyson's finest work.

When, two years afterwards, we came to hear Bain's

Lectures on Psychology, the two brothers never hesitated to express their dissent from his account of human nature. George used to declare that Bain's whole drift was really towards the bog of Atheism : and though William did not go that length, he conceived a distaste for Bain's too manifest Sensationalism that only became intensified in later years. The lack of any clear statements on the place and power of conscience as an original endowment of humanity was very offensive to him. I have often thought that less of Bain's own Psychological Methods and more of a comprehensive course of the History of Mental Philosophy was sorely needed by the students of those days. It was the lack of this teaching that gave the students of Edinburgh the strong pull they then had over Aberdonians.

The same zest with which Smith studied English Literature and Logic and Psychology was manifested in his reading of the Latin and Greek classics. This was seen at every turn of his being called up for recitation in the class. He always translated Latin and Greek with perfect accuracy : and when, as sometimes happened, a question was thrown open by the Professor to the whole class, it was seldom indeed that he failed to make a brilliant response. The Professor of Greek, Dr. W. D. Geddes, took great delight in poetic parallels and would occasionally give a brief reading from some verse translation of Homer. We had been studying the Iliad (Lib. xxii. ll. 209 ff.) where the poet says :

> "The Father then hung out the golden scales,
> Loading them both with fates of bitter death :
> To Achilles one, horse-taming Hector one ;
> And held them fairly poised with equal hand.
> Down sank the scale that carried Hector's doom
> To Pluto's realm and him Apollo left."

One day, instead of reading himself, he suddenly asked if any student before him could recall a similar description

of Divine judgment by a modern poet. Smith at once rose and with a fine measured enunciation recited the passage from *Paradise Lost* (Book IV., 999 ff.):

> "The Eternal to prevent such horrid fray
> Hung forth in heaven His golden scales yet seen
> Betwixt Astraea and the Scorpion signs,
> Wherein all things created first He weighed
> The pendulous round earth with balanced air
> In counterpoise; now ponders all events,
> Battles and realms. In these He put two weights,
> The sequel each of parting and of fight.
> The latter quick up flew and kicked the beam."

One can more easily imagine than describe the round of applause, given in the noisy fashion so dear to college lads, which this bright feat of memory evoked.

His brother, George, had more than once a similar reception for his fine appearances in the class. Though fully a year younger, he held his ground remarkably well. The two brothers were in perfect sympathy; but it was amusing to see how eager George was to keep alongside William. One day, as we walked home together, George quietly remarked to me: "There seems to be an impression that Willie is the best Grecian in the class; but I hope to show yet that I am quite as good as he." And so he did.

The many-sidedness of Smith's wonderful power of acquisition displayed itself no less in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy (Physical Science). We had many men in our class who had a great aptitude for these subjects: but, with the marked exception of William Minto, they were prone to undervalue or even scout others. Smith showed equal facility in mastering the most abstruse problems of pure and mixed Mathematics. On the one hand, he was quite at home in the Differential and Integral Calculus; on the other, he grappled as successfully with Dynamics, Optics, Electricity and Astronomy. The amazing rapidity with which he acquired knowledge led Pro-

fessor Fuller to imagine that he was overworking in this subject. When he succeeded equally well in others, the kindly Cantab. said that neither he nor Minto would ever reach fifty years of age. No more he did: but, as we shall see, it was not wholly from mere voluntary devotion to study.

With such gifts of acquisition, Smith could not fail to take a foremost place in every class throughout the whole curriculum. Even Natural Science, a course of Comparative Zoology and Geology and Mineralogy, which we could not escape for graduation, was good grain for his mill, and, taking the second prize out of the fingers of the medical students, he turned it into mental nutriment for the future. As a rule, he took the first place; some few times he had the second: only once, so far as I remember, did he descend to the third: never lower. Once and again, after the distribution of prizes, a cab was waiting at the corner of College Bounds to carry home the richly bound volumes awarded as prizes to the two brothers. At the close of the curriculum William intended to go in for Honours in Classics, Mathematics and Philosophy; and all of us were sure that he would have succeeded. But owing to an unfortunate illness, caused doubtless in some measure by overstrain, he was physically unable to face the examinations. It was a great offset that he was awarded the Town Council Gold Medal as the most distinguished student of his year.

Yet let it not be supposed that all this success was won by neglect of physical exercise. Mr. W. Keith Leask, commenting in his interesting book of reminiscences [1] on what he calls "the Smith Legend," has said: "No two men have worked such mischief in the Arts Faculty as did the two brothers from Keig in 1861-65. Were they not held up as demigods to succeeding classes? 'By our

[1] *Interamnia Borealis*, p. 216.

own spirits are we deified,' and the professoriate with the whole North created, fostered, begot and adulated with the maddest of hallelujahs this unfortunate type. It killed Minto and carried many to early graves. The poor white-faced boys from Keig used to be seen running out at night, hand in hand, for a breath of fresh air. *Sunt lacrymae rerum.*" There is a grievous exaggeration here Living in the west end of the new town, they had a long walk to King's College every morning, and I often walked back with them when the classes were over. Every summer vacation was utilised for long walks in the surrounding country; games and sports of all kinds were practised; and the lads returned to the work of each winter session, looking well and bright. In those days William insisted that it was some original delicacy of constitution and not overwork that shortened George's life. In truth, the studies at the Manse went on with such quiet regularity that the work of preparing for the classes in winter was comparatively light. George once told me in the course of our second session that neither he nor William had ever opened their Euclid to revise the propositions.

Need I say that throughout the four years at Aberdeen Smith took the keenest interest in the worship of the Lord's Day? His favourite preacher was Dr. A. Dyce Davidson, of the West Free Church; but, when any well-known minister from another city appeared in Aberdeen, he was sure to be one of the audience. In 1863, if I remember rightly, the minister who had been invited to preach the annual sermon of the Free Church Students' Association was Dr. James Begg, of Newington, Edinburgh. Begg was then at the height of his power as a preacher and gave to a crowded audience in the Music Hall a really fine sermon on the Headship of Christ from a favourite text of those days: "The Resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is on the

right hand of God, having gone into heaven: angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him." Sitting near Smith, I saw him listening with intense interest, and, as we met on the way out, he asked me what I thought of the sermon. "Very good, indeed." "Yes," he replied. "I venture to say that that is the grandest sermon I ever heard." The incident has often come back to my memory and has been very cheering to me in view of the boorish antagonism Smith had to endure at Begg's hands in later years. Who can doubt that these two are now under the shelter of the same Wing, all differences forgiven and forgotten amidst the sunshine of the everlasting hills?

After his great triumph in winning the Ferguson Scholarships in Mathematics and Classics, open to graduates of the four Scottish Universities, and also the Fullerton and Moir Scholarship in the same subject for Aberdeen, Smith naturally attracted the interest of a widening circle of friends. Many of them began to predict a great future for him. His power of forming judgments on public questions and his striking facility in expressing them seemed to take away the breath of some that met him. Mr. Mackenzie, a Glasgow magistrate, who was a relative of the family, went to pay a visit to the Manse and was met at the railway station by William in a pony phaeton. He told me that he was so amazed at his talk concerning the politics of the day that he would not have been surprised if Smith had gone into the legal profession. "I am sure," he added, "that, if he had done so, he would have reached the highest posts and could readily enough have become the greatest Lord Chancellor of his day." Indeed, some of our fellow-students, notably W. A. Gray, afterwards of the High Church in Elgin, held that Smith was a born lawyer. Gray used to say that, when they walked together, he showed a power of anticipating his thoughts that was simply "uncanny." "Pity

the man," he repeated, "whom Smith might cross-examine." But he had long before made up his mind to follow in his father's footsteps and study for the ministry of the Free Church of Scotland."

II.

As Smith had not reached the age of nineteen at the close of his studies in Aberdeen, he resolved to stay back a year before going on to Edinburgh as a student of Theology. Having come to the same decision, I had once more the pleasure of finding myself one of his classmates there. He, of course, went into the examination for scholarships and easily won the first place. The mathematical paper, set by Dr. Thomas Smith, was very difficult, and I remember how warmly Principal R. S. Candlish commented on the perfect accuracy with which "our friend from Aberdeen" had answered every question. Indeed, from his first appearance at New College, Smith's record made him a marked man; and his subsequent appointment as assistant to Professor Tait of the University only enhanced his already great reputation.

It was into the study of Hebrew that in those days Smith mainly threw his energy: and he was only pleased when he found others as keen as himself. To one fellow-student who sometimes pressed him closely in examinations he showed the kindest feeling. One time, he frankly said to him: "I think you have a keener eye for points and accents than I have." But in this class also he soon broke away into a path of his own. Having learned German during his intervening year off at Aberdeen, he went to Göttingen with Mr. J. S. Black and, reading constantly with his father in the later Autumn, he made great progress in the study of Hebrew. Asking him one day if he had been able to read much of the Old Testament, I was told that he had

studied a portion every day with unfailing regularity. "You must know," he added, "that my father is a capital Hebrew scholar. He read the whole Pentateuch in Hebrew last winter five times over." I have often since then thought that if some of the older ministers, who inveighed against this scholar's son in the Aberdeen chair, had only read some portions of it even once with care, they might have spared him their outcry about irreverence for the sacred books of the Law.

Dr. A. B. Davidson was naturally Smith's favourite teacher at New College and the professor in return made no attempt to disguise his admiration for his distinguished pupil. This was very manifest on the occasion of his handing in a class paper on Old Testament Prophecy. Fresh from the study of a richer Psychology than he had found in the writings of Bain at Aberdeen, Smith delineated with great acumen the mental and moral conditions under which the prophets received their revelations of Divine truth and so felt constrained to accept them as veritable messages from the Spirit of Jahweh which they had to deliver to the people. Davidson openly declared that up to that date he had never read any paper on the origin of the prophetic gift which was at once so interesting and profound. It was at that time that I used to assure our fellow-students that a large share of the mantle Davidson had received through Rabbi Duncan had begun to fall on the shoulders of Robertson Smith.

In the class of Church History taught by Dr. Rainy, Smith took no special interest. It was indeed a very perfunctory attendance that he gave to it, largely due to the fact that he had permission to devote a large portion of the time the class met to preparation for the coming struggle for the Shaw Fellowship in Philosophy. Yet there did occur one day when Smith was present, and Rainy

at once called him up for examination in the class. A very interesting combat of wits took place. Rainy plied him with repeated questions on the Pelagian controversy without finding any open crevice in the student's armour. Smith had evidently taken pains not merely to master the relevant portions of Kurtz's *Handbook*, but to read round about them; and the class showed that Smith only got his due when Rainy with some more warmth than usual thanked him for his responses. I ought to add that Rainy was never slow to praise Smith, when he had occasion. Every student of the class was then expected to write a homily on some given theme in Latin. Rainy read Latin constantly, and he said once in my hearing that Smith's paper was not only excellent in substance but written in Latin of the highest order. I often felt that if, like Cromwell in his day, any modern statesman had required a secretary who was a master of Latinity, he would have found in Smith one fully equipped for the work.

In the class of Systematic Theology, Smith's attendance was also somewhat broken and his interest not very strong. He had been early drilled in the main tenets of the Reformation, and being naturally conservative, found it difficult to believe that anything of essential value could be added to what he already knew. Moreover, after studying the Old Testament under A. B. Davidson, we all felt that the old method of buttressing Christian doctrines by texts adduced without due reference to their grammatico-historical meaning and connexion was no longer admissible, and that the presentments of truth given by post-Reformation theologians like Francis Turrettin were bound to undergo radical transformation. On the other hand, the Professor, Dr. James MacGregor, was a rigid dogmatician of the old school, and, while having a really acute mind, was too defective in judgment to deal wisely with students

and their essays. The result was that Smith came early into conflict with him in a paper on Predestination. Private interviews took place, at which he tried as far as possible to meet MacGregor's views. But the last issue was that Smith came to regard Dogmatic of the old stamp as nothing but *caviare*. Meeting him one day with a volume of Hodge under my arm, I was asked what tome it was that I was going to devour. On my showing him the title, he hurried off to the library exclaiming: "The greatest rubbish since Chalmers!"

It was doubtless under the prompting of such convictions that in his opening address as President of the New College Theological Society, Smith was led to use these significant words: "We were recently told, for example, by a man of great mark in our Church that the function of a Professor of Dogmatic Theology is simply the elucidation and vindication of the system of doctrines already deduced from Scripture and embodied in our Confession of Faith and other orthodox confessions. We are to believe that systematic theology has passed entirely and conclusively from the dialectic to the deductive stage; the dogma of the Reformed Churches admits only of such discussion as may serve to vindicate it from attack. But if Systematic Theology is really in this state, it is vain to speak of Theology as a Science advancing dialectically; for it is the characteristic of a dialectical progress that all parts advance together and no part can be perfect before the others. . . . It is absurd to think that such a position can be honestly aimed at, unless we are prepared to allow that there may be in our present theology not only defect but error; that even leading ideas may have a relative rather than an absolute validity; and that those requirements of the Christian consciousness which they supply approximately may be fully supplied partly by a new arrangement, partly

by real modifications of our main theological principles." [1] No more pregnant utterance ever fell from his lips. It is doubtful if even now the lesson it conveys has been duly pondered. Perchance the fully united Church of Scotland may be stirred up to undertake that radical revision of the Confessional theology which is so much needed for retaining the thoughtful minds of the day within the ranks of her service.

When the theological curriculum came to an end, Smith was again first in the Board examination, reaching an aggregate of marks that had never been equalled. Happily also there was no sign of physical exhaustion. On the contrary, throughout his whole course as a student of theology, he had been growing in physical energy. In spite of a natural pallor in his face, he was in excellent health and full of virile activity. He never spared himself exercise in the open air and had been so interested in gymnastics while in Germany that he came to excel in surprising feats of agility. In the room attached to the common hall of New College, which was much used by the athletes among the students, I have seen Smith go through feats on the cross-bar which no man there could ever attempt. In those years, no one amongst us was more alive to the necessity of obeying the maxim we used to read in Juvenal:

Orandum est ut sit mens sana in corpore sano.

J. P. Lilley.

ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ IN NEW TESTAMENT AND POLYBIUS.

Very early in their first war with Carthage the Romans found that "the only hope of making progress" lay "in creating a fleet and ceasing to leave Carthage the unchallenged ruler of the western seas." Polybius tells us

[1] *Lectures and Essays*, pp. 140, 142.

"how this task was undertaken, how vessels were built with surprising speed on the model of a stranded Punic ship, how crews of oarsmen were meanwhile taught to swing together in skeleton ships, great stages or frames erected on dry land." [1] The historian continues:—

προκατασκευασθέντων δὲ τούτων, ἅμα τῷ συντελεσθῆναι τὰς ναῦς καθελκύσαντες καὶ βραχὺν χρόνον ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν θαλάττῃ πειραθέντες ἔπλεον κ.τ.λ.[2]

This passage helps us to catch the thought which the New Testament writers wished to convey by means of the word ἀλήθεια. They were in the position of those earliest Roman oarsmen. They and their forefathers had been trained in "skeleton ships," on benches set up on dry land, to go through movements that produced no motion, to keep their eye on a κελευστής and render a punctilious obedience that left all things as they were.

So they wrote of τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, they cried ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται, and οὐδὲν ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος, and gloried in Christ Jesus as τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι καταργήσας. And they expressed the contrast which dominated their thoughts and lives in the words—

ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωυσέως ἐδόθη,
ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια
διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο.

Yes, the Law was a good gift of God. Precept and figure were as needful as those cries and time beatings of the κελευστής. But the arrival of grace to fulfil the precepts, and of substance to interpret figure, was as mighty a change as those Romans experienced.

ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν θαλάττῃ πειραθέντες.

Now, as the ship sprang forward every oarsman could see the value of the movements which he had been taught to make and the supreme importance of making them in concert.

[1] See Heitland, *A Short History of the Roman Republic*, p. 99.
[2] Polybius i. 21–3.

So. St. Paul writes (Eph. iv. 24)—

ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς . . . τὸν πάλαιον ἄνθρωπον . . . καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.

"There is reality in Jesus for *you* to put away the old nature and to put on the new nature, even that which was created after God in a righteousness and holiness of the reality."

And St. John (1 St. John ii. 8) :—

"Again a new command am I writing to you,

ὅ ἐστιν ἀληθὲς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἡ σκοτία παράγεται καὶ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἤδη φαίνει."

Love, the substance of that new command, "is real in Him and (so) in you, for the darkness is passing away and now at last the light of the reality is lighting us."

In the opening of his Letter to Colossæ St. Paul speaks of "the Hope" or Prospect "which had been (long) treasured up in the heavens" for Christians.

ἣν προηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας
τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς,
καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν
καρποφορούμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον,
καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν,
ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε
τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.

'The Colossians had heard some time ago of the fulfilment of the Hope so long treasured up for them in the heavens; for the message of the arrival of the Reality had come to them; and the good-tidings which the Risen Lord brought from the Cross and Grave (Eph. ii. 17) is at work upon them as a present power, even as over all the world it is to be found, everywhere putting forth its fruits and spreading its branches even as it has done in the Colossians from the day that they heard and recognised the arrival of the grace of God in reality."

Here we see the same forceful closing upon the word ἀλήθεια as we saw in the passage from the sister epistle, the same coupling together of χάρις and ἀλήθεια as we have in St. John's Prologue, the same overpowering sense of a mighty energy that has now begun to work in the world, an energy to which those who have welcomed it are

bearing witness by their lives. The Lord's promise is on all hands being made good—*γνώσεσθε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐλευθερώσει ὑμᾶς* (St. John viii. 32).

At the end of Book xii. (ch. 28) Polybius quotes a Proem of Timæus (†B.C. 256) in which he says that history differs from rhetoric as

τὰ κατ' ἀλήθειαν ᾠκοδομημένα καὶ κατεσκευασμένα

differ from

τῶν ἐν ταῖς σκηνογραφίαις φαινομένων τόπων καὶ διαθέσεων,

and he reproduces the contrast just afterwards in the words

τὰ κατ' ἀλήθειαν οἰκοδομήματα τῶν ἐν ταῖς σκηνογραφίαις τόπων.

I confess that on coming on these passages some forty years after I began learning Greek my first thought was of a plumbline. They helped to revolutionise my conception of the force of *ἀλήθεια* in the New Testament.

(*a*) *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας* (St. John xiv. 17, xv. 26, xvi. 13; 1 John iv. 6).

The whole burden of our Lord's words to the Eleven in the Upper Room and on the way to Gethsemane is that what they are losing, though the fairest thing that earth has ever known, is but a prelude to the Reality which He is to win for them by the Cross. The "other Interpreter," whom the Father will send in His Name, to glorify Him, whom He will breathe into them, is "the Life-Breath of the Reality." Not till that evening probably could the title have begun to be intelligible to them.

(*b*) *ἡ ἐπίγνωσις τῆς ἀληθείας* (Heb. x. 26; cf. Col. i. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 4, iv. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 25, iii. 7; Tit. i. 1; 2 John 1, *ἐγνωκότες*; John viii. 32, *γνώσεσθε*).

Remembering what Dr. Armitage Robinson has taught us about the "directive" force of the preposition in the verb *ἐπιγινώσκω*, and taking with it what has been pointed out as to *ἀλήθεια*, we can hardly fail to see a marked fitness in the phrase *ἐπιγνῶναι τὴν ἀλήθειαν* to describe the experi-

ence of those who with "honest and good hearts," "hearts made clear by faith," were enabled to recognise the reality when it "came through Jesus Christ." If we think of all the Divine education of Israel and of mankind as preparing them to recognise and welcome the reality that is behind all figures, and if we let our own hearts tell us that for most of us falsehood is the taking of the figure as the reality, we shall not wonder at the awful severity of that passage in 2 Thessalonians about those who "did not accept that love of the reality" the kindling of which was the end of all God's ways, and the only conceivable way of salvation (2 Thess. ii. 10 ff.).

(c) *ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας* (2 Cor. vi. 7, *λόγῳ ἀληθείας*; Eph. i. 13, 2 Tim. ii. 15, St. James i. 18, *λόγῳ ἀληθείας*).

In St. James' remarkable phrase *βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας*, taken in connexion with the words that come just afterwards, *δέξασθε τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν* (i. 21), if *λόγῳ ἀληθείας* means "by a message of a reality" (that has "become through Jesus Christ"), we seem to get the thought of the new creation clearly expressed, and to have the way prepared for the mention of "the law of liberty," "law in its perfection" (i. 25), and light is thrown upon the phrase *τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ* (cf. Eph. iv. 24).

(*d*) In Romans ii. 2, if we may understand *κατ' ἀλήθειαν* in a way akin to that in which it is used by Timæus (as quoted above), the apostle is not saying that we know that God judges accurately, but that His judgment has the terrible reality indicated in the preceding verses (i. 26 ff.).

(*e*) And once more; in 2 Peter i. 12 *ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ* will recall the *ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο* ("arrived") of St. John, and the *τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς* of St. Paul (Col. i. 5).

G. H. Whitaker.

HANDLEY CARR GLYN MOULE.

THIS paper is divided into two parts. In Part I. an attempt is made to describe the main features of the life and character of Handley Carr Glyn Moule, lately Bishop of Durham, and to trace the varied influences which went to make him what he was. In Part II. his writings are described and their value estimated.

PART I.

1. Handley was the youngest of the eight sons of the Rev. Henry Moule, and first saw the light in the closing days of 1841 in the Vicarage of Fordington, now part of the Town of Dorchester. The occupants of the Vicarage live again in the charming account of his old home which the Bishop wrote seventy years after his birth under the title "Memories of a Vicarage." His father was a fine example of the Evangelical Pastor of the first half of the Nineteenth Century. Thomas Hardy's mother, who knew Mr. Henry Moule in early days, spoke of him as "a tall, noble-looking young man." His interests and activities took a very wide range. He built schools, fought the cholera in 1849 and 1854 and brought pressure to bear upon the then Managers of the Duchy of Cornwall estates to remedy the shockingly insanitary condition of the houses of the poor in his parish, while he himself invented methods of meeting that condition. He received into his Vicarage a number of pupils whom with the aid of able tutors he educated with his own sons. Above all he rejoiced to proclaim the unsearchable riches of Christ

and to bring into the fold lost and straying souls. Handley's mother was a woman of great strength of character and of notable abilities, a model mother and a model Pastor's wife. Her youngest son was devotedly attached to her. From her he received his earliest religious impressions and his were the arms which received her when she was suddenly stricken with paralysis in June 1877. His elder brothers were men of great and varied powers (one was Senior Classic in 1857, another became Bishop and another Archdeacon in China), and they delighted to lead their youngest brother, not only into "the fair fields of ancient letters," but into "the use of tools, swimming, nest-hunting, cricket and other games."

Young Handley was often ailing in early years and for four or five years of his boyhood was unable to do much reading by reason of ulceration of the cornea, but in the stimulating intellectual atmosphere of his own home he laid the foundation of sound classical scholarship and of mastery of English language and literature, which he was to turn to such good result in years to come. Best of all, the boy learnt from his parents the beauty of true religion. "Times without number," he wrote long afterwards, "my child-eyes watched my mother, morning and night, kneeling in long communion with her Lord in prayer, while I wondered how she could find so much to say in silence to her invisible Friend, and insensibly drew deep into my soul the thought, as a primary fact of existence, that prayer was a work, most real, most momentous."

2. The year 1860 saw this son of a Dorset vicarage enter Cambridge as a member of Trinity College. Some interesting reminiscences of his undergraduate days are to be found in a Preface contributed by him to *Memorials of W. P. Turnbull* (p. 19). "In May, 1862," he writes, "I had the surprise and happiness of finding myself elected one of

the foundation scholars of that year. It was our first opportunity in those days. There were only four of us second-year men in the list. Turnbull, F. W. H. Myers, Purkiss were the three with whom to my delight I found myself elected; the gladness of that old morning is present now to my heart. Next day we were admitted in the Chapel, placing our hands in feudal fashion within the hands of our mighty master, William Whewell." His friend Turnbull was second wrangler and Smith's prizeman in 1864, was elected Fellow the same year as Handley Moule, and became one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. He was a brilliant, many-gifted and earnest man. "We lived constantly in the sort of life-neighbourhood, which a pure and healthy college friendship so delightfully makes possible. We were always meeting at the boats, which we both loved. We often walked together, sometimes capping verses against each other. We belonged to a small Essay Society.[1] We found ourselves members too of a large and less organised circle, a group of friends, many of them Harrovians fresh from Vaughan's noble influence, for whom I, who came from no school . . . , can never enough give thanks to God. . . . What teachers we had, what exemplars in the leaders of the College! Whewell was master, Sedgwick vice-master, J. B. Lightfoot, J. L. Hammond and R. Burn were my tutors: Thompson (afterwards master), W. G. Clark, Cope, Munro were lecturers. And in the University Church, then always full, we had ever and again the consummate ministry of Vaughan. It was a great time. . . .

"Turnbull and I after our degree made a sort of firm as private tutors, he in Mathematics, I in Classics." In

[1] See a quotation from a dialogue on Preaching, contributed by H.C.G.M. to this Society in 1865, giving a striking description of his brother George as a preacher, in *Memories of a Vicarage*, pp. 80–81).

1863 these two with three others "hired a perfect tub-four, and in four or five days we traversed that most beautiful waterway [the Thames from Oxford to Putney], and laid up innumerable memories." The noble Commemoration Sermon entitled "Wise men and Scribes," preached by the Bishop in Trinity College Chapel in 1907, gives us an insight into the effect upon this most sensitive mind and spirit of the stimulating environment in which he found himself. He recalls "This College, this Chapel; the whole life of Trinity, including its worship; the entire educative power working here upon mind and soul . . ." "So deep and ample is the debt which as an old *alumnus* I owe to this great House, that I can believe . . . that no son of its vast family owes more to its influence than I do. Thought goes back to the remote moment when, a child, in 1850 I first entered this Chapel, while Walmisley's hands traversed the organ-keys in the opening voluntary; and then it passes to another October ten years later, when first I worshipped here, a wearer of the blue gown; and to yet another, five years later, when, kneeling in the master's stall after election [as Fellow] I placed my hands within Whewell's hands, the last man ever admitted into Fellowship by him. . . . Well may a man feel, in face of such years past, that the place and its life has entered into his very being, and has so acted upon it that he cannot easily think that Trinity ever told much more powerfully upon any of its members."

When the Classical Tripos list came out in February 1864 H. C. G. Moule and F. W. H. Myers were bracketted Second Classics, the Senior Classic being H. W. Moss, afterwards Headmaster of Shrewsbury. A year later Moule was elected to a Fellowship at Trinity.

Forty years later (1905), being by this time Bishop of Durham, he published a slim volume entitled *Imitations and Translations, English, Latin and Greek, mostly of*

Long Ago, which he "inscribed with a grateful heart to the always living memory of my three College Tutors, Joseph Barber Lightfoot, James Lempriere Hammond and Robert Burn." They give an insight into the mind and power of the young scholar of Trinity. Here is a Greek epigram, "which with a Latin companion obtained Sir W. Browne's Medal in 1863." Here is an inscription, set up within Auckland Castle, which runs thus:

> Est tua, CHRISTE, domus; sine Te nil intus agatur;
> Ipse foco et mensae pacis Dator optimus adsis,
> Nocturnoque velis Ipse invigilare cubili.[1]

But the greater part of the volume is taken up by a dramatic poem called "Apollo at Pherae," "written at many intervals during my undergraduate years, and at length printed privately." The Prologue, dated from Fordington Vicarage July 27, 1865, explains that it is an attempt to imitate the Greek masters with a constant regard to the style of our own great writers who most resemble them." The poem is based on a Classic legend of the banishment of Apollo by his father for ten years to earth, and how Apollo spent these years at Pherae, concealing his godhead in the guise of a shepherd. The poem describes his last day on earth and his return to heaven. There is a maturity in style and diction which shows how deeply he had drunk at Greek fountains, and which reveals the poetic gift that for six years between 1869 and 1876 (inclusive) won for him the Seatonian Prize for English verse and that in later years gave to the Church some of the best religious verse of our time. In 1904 the author added to his short drama the following Epilogue, in which

[1] In *Auckland Castle* (1918) the Bishop gave the following English version of the above:—

> The house, O Christ, is Thine; be Thou of all its life the guide;
> Peace-giving Lord, at hearth and board be present to preside,
> And near our bed, unsleeping Friend, through every watch abide.

he recalls the spirit and surroundings of its first composition :

Thus in old years, in memory's flowery June,
Touched to the soul by the Attic muse's charm,
I sang the Power conceal'd, and pleased me well
With dreams of pastoral Thessaly. They rose,
Filling the silent fancy, now in scenes
Of summer leisure, where Dorcestrian meads,
Well-watered by thy wimpling lapse, bright Frome,
Wind their delicious length, and poplars tall
Ride like a scattered fleet with shadowy sails
Above the waves of mowing grass ; and now
In thee, O college of my heart's long love,
In that old upstairs chamber, wide and low,
A nest of pleasant corners, where the hearth
Glowed on the book-lined wall, and a clear chime
Of plashing waters through my casement came,
Played by the courtyard fountain. Fast and far,
Since that remembered golden time, the hours
Have fleeted down with me. Yet now, as then,
Full oft I feel the Attic muse's charm,
Coming, amidst a world of later thoughts,
To dream the old dreams once more, and e'en presume
To spread them out for kindly eyes to see
As in that other age. Nor less, methinks,
Such interlude in consecrated toil
Pleases to-day the spirit, that a Light
Now suns me, from the sky above this blue,
Sacred, benign—the assurance of a Love,
No fable but supernal Truth ; the Name
Of Him, Who once a Shepherd on our hills,
His radiant Godhead for a while disguising,
Here for His flock death-wounded, for His flock
Passed hence, ascending to His Heaven again.

May, 1904.

In 1865, the year of his election to a Trinity Fellowship, Handley Moule became a form-master at Marlborough. "There in the mercy of God (he wrote long afterwards) I found a new reality in my Saviour and Lord, and was ordained in 1867." From 1867 to 1872, and again from his mother's death in 1877 till his father's death in 1880, he

served as his father's curate at Fordington. A slender volume, *Dorchester Poems*, published in 1878, contains a striking little poem, which shows the spirit of the man at this time. It is called "Fordington Pulpit, a preacher's week-day thoughts," and is dated 1878. It is too long to quote in full. He revisits on the Monday the church in which he had preached on the previous day and meditates:

". . . . . .
Let me through this narrow door
Climb the pulpit steps once more.
Blessed place! The Master's Word,
Child and man, I hence have heard.
Awful place! for hence in turn
I have taught—so slow to learn.
Sure the eternal Master's hand
Beckons me a while apart;
Bids me in His presence stand
While he looks me through the heart.
Sinful preacher, ask again
In this nearness of thy Lord,
How to Him hath rung thy strain
When it seemed to speak His word.
Has He found thy message true?
Truth and truly spoken too?
Uttered with a purpose whole
From a self-forgetful soul,
Bent on nothing save the fame
Of the great Redeeming Name,
And the pardon, life and bliss
Of the souls He bought for His?
Think!—but ah, with thoughts like these
Hasten, sinner, to thy knees."

1878.

The four intervening years (1873–1877) were spent at Cambridge. His College recalled him to take up duties as one of its Deans. He had rooms just west of the clock tower in the Old Court, and to them it was his pleasure on Sunday evenings to welcome "a gathering of undergraduate

friends. We sang a hymn together and knelt in prayer, and then opened the Greek Testament for half an hour of exposition." I quote from the preface to a small volume, *Jesus and the Resurrection*, which he published twenty years later. It contains expositions of the closing chapter of St. John's Gospel, which he gave during one session to those of us who were fortunate enough to be invited to his rooms. He inscribes the book "to any who may still remember that Upper Chamber in the Old Court."

3. The year 1880 saw the beginning of a new chapter in his life-history. Ridley Hall was planned as a Graduate Training College for the Ministry, and Mr. Moule was chosen to be its first Principal. The first block of buildings only contained rooms for eight students and they were at once filled. Two other blocks were added later and a chapel. Before long some thirty sets of rooms were provided at the Hall, while additional students found lodgings in the neighbourhood. Here for nineteen years was wrought out a ministry fraught with inspiration and power, the issues of which have been felt throughout the world. At Ridley Hall itself (in the chapel, in the Library lecture-room, and in the Home) the Principal brought all his powers of mind and spirit to bear upon the successive generations of students, who flocked to him for training. At least five hundred men passed through his hands; some fifteen have become Bishops; a great number have done and are doing yeoman service in the ministry at home and abroad; more than one has died a martyr's death in the Mission Field. The early morning expositions of the Greek Testament in Chapel were a unique combination of scholarly acumen, masterly command of English, and spiritual insight into the message of the passage under review. The daily lectures on Christian doctrine and on the Prayer Book called forth the Principal's stores of learning and the acuteness of his thinking. To all

his students he gave of his very best. Perhaps he beheld them, or some of them, through too rosy spectacles, "and was prone to credit them with virtues which had hardly yet emerged into reality." "Sometimes," says an old student, now a Bishop, "when he ought to have dressed us down, he, to our great confusion, applied that process to himself. If it is a fault to believe in men too much, it is a grand fault. It may lead to mistakes here and there, but it gives a man a standard to live up to and calls forth the best of which he is capable." Nor was he only the exemplar and exponent of sound theology and heart-religion. "There was in him a gay and irrepressible sense of humour . . . No one more keenly enjoyed a joke, or related with more gusto an amusing story." Oxford men, who were present at the opening of Hannington Hall, will not easily forget Dr. Moule's speech. The street, in which the Hall was built, was memorable, he said, in that King Edward, when Prince of Wales, had lodged in it, before he went *to complete his education at Cambridge*. A little later, speaking of Bishop Hannington, he referred to a man-eating lion, who gave great trouble at a station in East Africa, "until a missionary went and shot it *in a Christian spirit*." In *Auckland Castle* (1918) he tells how a friend in the exercise of his duties as a Chaplain to the Forces was near the field of the battle of Crecy. He mentioned to a group of English officers the fact that the Bishop of Durham had been present at that battle in full armour at the head of his men. "Ah," remarked one of the officers, "Church-leaders were of some use in those days!"

In his work at Ridley and after, until her death in 1915, he was ably and warmly aided by his wife, who was a daughter of the Rev. C. Boileau Elliott, F.R.S.

But his influence extended far outside the walls of Ridley Hall. The whole University felt his power. His strengthen-

ing, steadying, inspiring hold upon large numbers of Undergraduates was of untold value. This was especially the case at times when the more enthusiastic of the men were liable to be swept off their feet by the fervour of great movements —such times as Moody's Mission, the early years of the Student Christian Movement, and a period when the call of the Mission Field was urgent in the ears of the most wholehearted of the Christian men. The Sunday evening sermons from Simeon's pulpit in Holy Trinity Church, the devotional addresses given at Undergraduate meetings in church or in the Henry Martyn Hall, the crowded gatherings on Sunday evenings in the drawing-room of the Principal's Lodge, besides innumerable private talks and interviews, gave him splendid opportunities which he used to the full. Unbalanced views were discouraged, enthusiasm led into wise channels, the Home and Overseas ministries set in due perspective and questioning souls guided and helped. "The theme of all his teaching may be stated in two words. It was Jesus Christ. Everything in his sermons radiated from Jesus Christ and returned upon Him."

4. In 1884, four years after he had become Principal of Ridley Hall, came a new experience, which profoundly influenced his whole subsequent life and ministry. The story can best be given largely in his own words. Staying with friends at Polmont in Scotland, he was present as a listener at the meetings of a convention held in the great barn on the estate there to promote the deepening of spiritual life, in connection with the movement which has for the last forty-five years found its centre at Keswick. He had been afraid of the movement, thinking that it taught a doctrine of sinless perfection. But on the second night two addresses were given. The first showed how possible it was to "let the self-life intrude itself into the work of God." The second piled up the

promises of God to the soul that will do two things towards Him—surrender itself into His hands and trust Him for His mighty victory within. "As these promises were recited, grace enabled me to take them as meant to act. And so, in the great mercy of God, before I left that barn, two consciousnesses came upon me, one that I was the absolute bond-slave of a sovereign Master, the other that I had found a Friend and Liberator, Who would, so long and so much as I looked to Him, make me more than conqueror over the most subtle approach and invitation of evil." Thirty-five years later the Bishop of Durham stood upon the platform in the tent at Keswick, his face lit up with the joy of the Lord, and witnessed to the faithfulness of his Divine Master during the years that had passed since that revelation of His grace and power. This newly experienced "Secret of the Presence" was speedily put to the test. The following Term at Cambridge brought great labours, many perplexities, grave problems relating to movements at work among the Undergraduates. In a power not his own he was able to meet every difficulty with a quiet mind and a triumphant faith. He trusted his Lord and found Him wholly true. In the following Lent Term he gave to the University Church Society that impressive series of addresses, which were published immediately afterwards under the title of *Thoughts on Christian Sanctity*. It was of this little volume that Canon Bright remarked: "This book I shall always keep within reach of my hand." No one can read this and other later writings of the same kind without realising the perfect sanéness and the balanced judgment, as well as the spiritual power, with which he set forth on the one hand the claims and the promises of his sovereign Lord, and on the other the certainty that the soul that trusted Him would find Him wholly sufficient for every need and circumstance of life. So far from encouraging

the extreme views of certain undergraduates, as some have imagined, no one protested more powerfully or laboured more manfully to drive them away.

5. In 1895 he took his D.D. degree, presenting as his thesis an excellent edition of Bishop Ridley *On the Lord's Supper*, with an Introduction of his own. Four years later the Heads of Colleges elected Dr. Moule to the Norrisian Professorship of Divinity. It was to him and his wife a very great wrench to leave the home and work at Ridley Hall, but the call had come to move on, and the Professorship offered him a high official standing, from which his influence might go forth far and wide; and he could not hold back. He had, however, hardly found his feet as Professor, when a fresh call came. Lord Salisbury offered him the bishopric of Durham, in succession to Bishop Westcott. The writer of the Obituary notice in the *Times* justly pointed out that his selection was exactly comparable to those of his predecessors in the See, Bishops Lightfoot and Westcott. "Each had been a high Classic and Fellow of Trinity, each had been a Cambridge Professor of Divinity, each had had a remarkable influence on young men." Dr. Moule had also seen parish work. He was eight years at Fordington. Moreover, "like Westcott, he had joined the Christian Social Union," and had shown that he was well aware of the social problems to be faced and that he believed in the power of Christ to solve them. The spirit in which the Bishop entered upon his great charge is seen in the sermon he preached in Durham Cathedral on the day of his enthronement. The text was, "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake." I quote a few lines. "I have presumed to unfold this Apostolic word to you in order that I may . . . in this day of my induction to my seat among you, impose its message above all upon myself.

What to me . . . is the meaning of this day with its moving pomp of ceremony, its choral songs, its majesty of worship in this old and awful house of God? To the man whom you thus solemnly welcome it means an unspeakable humbling and a call as from heaven itself, to live henceforth for nothing but the service of God to you. . . . He presents himself humbly before you . . . a redeemed sinner, annexed by Jesus Christ, who hopes that his one conscious ambition is . . . to be in some sort the Evangelist and the pastor among you, proclaiming while he can Christ Jesus his Lord as King and presenting himself as altogether yours to serve you for Jesus sake." For nearly nineteen years the Bishop lived out this his ideal before the eyes of men. He responded nobly to the call made upon him by a diocese throbbing with industrial life, and served its people with all his heart and mind to the end of his life. "He cared immensely for the miners and for the men in the shipyards."

He felt the intellectual stimulus of ministering to the hard-headed men of the North and his preaching seemed to gain year by year in virility and strength. Never did he speak with more force than in the last years of his life. Even at the age of seventy-eight his hair was still dark and his bodily vigour almost unabated. When he preached to the miners in the Cathedral, they crowded to hear him. "They came expecting to be led to the Cross and to hear of Christ, and they were never disappointed. He lent his great genius to simple and beautiful expositions of the way to God and the ways of God, and they loved him for it." In the same spirit he dealt with the clergy. In all administrative action he was scrupulously fair. He knew the multifarious difficulties of the clerical life. As at Ridley, so at Durham, "he was, if anything, too kind and generous, too trustful and patient; but his one purpose was to lead, to encourage, to enable

them so to fulfil their ministry that souls might be saved. The Clergy as a whole, whatever their churchmanship, revered him, trusted him and listened to him. They welcomed him to their parishes and their pulpits, because he helped them, because he was a man come from God." It was a leading High Churchman who, after a Visitation address on the need of personal growth in holiness, declared: "There is not a Bishop in Christendom who could help us better than our Bishop does in these things."

In nothing did the Bishop's genius shine out more than in his wonderful Confirmation addresses. He "loved the work," writes one who often heard him, "and was simply splendid with the candidates of all ages. He talked to the children as simply as a father addressing his own little ones, and yet his addresses were full of deep spiritual teaching expressed in perfect English. I have again and again seen pit lads and working-girls and country lads and lasses just spell-bound as they listened to him."

As showing vividly his sympathy with the miners, as with all classes of his fellow-men, it is worth noting that three times a garden party was given at Auckland Castle by the Bishop and Mrs. Moule to about 800 aged miners and their wives, coming from the Homes provided by the Aged Miners' Association. Their hosts had them conveyed by car or train from all the various districts; luncheon and tea, with games and music, were arranged in the Castle garden, and a short service with an address by the Bishop in the beautiful chapel. Hosts and guests alike thoroughly enjoyed these gatherings.

In all the highest features of his exalted office Dr. Moule was truly a great Bishop, a noble chief Pastor, a true servant of God and friend of men—but nothing would grieve him more than that such things should be said of him, unless at the same time all the glory were given to Him, whose

humble bond-servant he ever was and to whose merits and grace he trusted utterly to the very end.

His Home-going was as beautiful as his life. His last public act was to preach before the King and Queen at Windsor, his text being, "Unto whom coming, a living Stone, ye also as living stones are built up," and his sermon was full of power. On May 8, after a short illness, he passed away at the house of his elder brother Charles, to whom he was devotedly attached, in the tranquillity of strong faith. One who ministered to him within twenty-four hours of the end writes: "It was beautiful to see the brightness of his smile and the look of absolute content upon his countenance." On May 11, the first part of the funeral was held in the College chapel which he loved so well, the coffin being met at the Great Gate by the Master, the Fellows and the Choir, and followed by the mourners and the members, past and present, of Ridley Hall. Thus was ended a connection with Cambridge stretching over very many years, a connexion of profound spiritual significance for many generations of Undergraduates and others. Two days later, on Ascension Day, the second part of the funeral was held at Durham. The scenes in Bishop Auckland and in all the mining villages on the route were most touching. The universal grief bore eloquent testimony to the place which the Bishop held in their hearts and minds. The great Cathedral was packed with clergy and laity of all types and kinds. The procession from the Cathedral to the Bow Cemetery, in which the bodies of his wife and daughter already lay, was so long that, it is said, the end of the line had not left the Cathedral when the head of it reached the cemetery half a mile distant. "Obdormivit in Christo" were the words engraved upon the name plate of the coffin. When Bishop Lightfoot was consecrated Dr. Westcott preached the sermon from the text: "They

go *from strength to strength*. Every one of them appeareth before God in Zion." The words were true of both Lightfoot and Westcott—but not even of them were they more true than of Christ's great servant and their successor, Handley Carr Glyn Moule.

Part II.

The years at Ridley Hall were memorable, not only for the services rendered personally by lip and life in Cambridge itself, but also for the large output of literary work, which extended his influence throughout the English-speaking world—indeed further, for two or three of his devotional writings were translated into other tongues. Even amid the incessant activities of his life as Bishop his pen was not idle. A considerable number of books and booklets were published during the nineteen years at Auckland Castle. Altogether he published about sixty books, some forty booklets, pamphlets and single poems and wrote at least thirty Introductions and Prefaces to the writings of others.

We may for convenience divide his writings into four classes: (1) Works of Theology, (2) Expositions, (3) Devotional writings, (4) Biographical and miscellaneous literature.

1. *Works of Theology.*

Dr. Foakes Jackson once said to the writer: "Dr. Moule is a *Theologian*—almost the only one in Cambridge to-day" (or words to that effect). This was true. His main strength was put forth in other directions, but what Handley Moule did put forth in the way of Theological writing was of admirable workmanship. We have already noted his interesting and valuable edition of Bishop Ridley's *On the Lord's Supper*, with a Preface and various notes and appendices. It will be enough to mention in passing his *Faith, its Nature and Work*, his section of *English*

Church Teaching, his *Veni Creator*, and a number of smaller treatises, of which that on *Justifying Righteousness* is perhaps the best known. The book which above all shows the trained Theological mind is his small volume, *Outlines of Christian Doctrine*. The amount of work put into this unpretending volume, which Hodder & Stoughton published in 1889 in their "Theological Educator" series, is out of all proportion to its size. All competent Theologians, of whatever type they may be, will bear witness to the clarity of thought, the grasp of argument and the felicity of diction, which distinguish the book. The publishers, I believe, wished for a book on the Thirty-nine Articles, but the author, with characteristic generosity, did not like to produce a book that would compete with another volume on the same lines, which was then in use at Ridley. Probably the book would have commanded a larger sale among Candidates for Holy Orders, if it had been cast in the form proposed; but in every other respect the form adopted was much to be preferred, as enabling the author to deal with the subject freely on natural lines. Here is one quotation out of many which I should have liked to make, chosen as showing how the theologian in Dr. Moule formulated the experience of grace, which we spoke of in Part I., section 4.

"The deepest of all truths about the fact of 'coming to Christ,' the truth that carries all other truths with it, is that the man is *united to Christ*, as to the head of a spiritual organism, with which He stands in a connexion altogether unique. The contact of faith is perfectly simple in itself; it is no more and no less than the personal confidence of the awakened soul, on the ground of Divine truth and promise. But it carries with it profound and incalculable results, because of the object which it touches, Jesus Christ, Son of God and Son of man, Second man, Mediator of the New Covenant. The man, awakened by the Spirit and con-

fiding in the Son, not only approaches Christ; he is joined to Him, 'One Spirit.' He is 'IN Him,' partaker of His life in a sense illustrated in Scripture by the union of limb with Head, branch with Vine, etc. . . . This mysterious but most real contact is the basis of all the man's spiritual gains and possessions. One with Christ, he possesses, and he is enjoined to use, all that Christ has for His true member. . . . But now all this is the work of the Spirit. . . . The Spirit acts in all this not as an instrument merely, external to his pupil, or an artificer, external to his work. True to His divine name, He penetrates the man's being as the vehicle of the New Birth, the breath of the New Life. He enters into a deep, tender harmony with the human spirit, recreating it into restored union with Himself: not abolishing or absorbing, but possessing. . . . The Spirit does all this to the member, while being also the Spirit, Who abides in supreme fulness in the Head. He is thus a bond of Divine strength and tenderness between member and Head" (pp. 132-3; see further on the same subject pp. 136 and 192 to 198).

2. *Expositions and Commentaries.*

In the year Handley Moule went to Ridley Hall there was published in the Cambridge Bible for Schools a Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, which won speedy recognition as combining to an exceptional degree accurate scholarship, theological grasp, and a gift for spiritual and edifying comment. This was followed by further volumes in the same series on the Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians. In the Expositor's Bible the same hand expounded the Epistle to the Romans, and in later years he wrote Ephesian, Philippian and Colossian "Studies," *The Cross and the Spirit* (studies in the Epistle to the Galatians), *Messages from the Epistle to the Hebrews*,

etc., all of which had a large circulation. Combining a reverent love for his subject-matter with a mastery of both Greek and English and an inward knowledge of the spiritual experiences described, Dr. Moule was an ideal expositor of the great Pauline epistles. He seems to get as near to the heart of the Apostle as it is possible for any one of a later age to do. "His one aim," as he himself said in the preface to one of his "Studies," was "to exhibit something of the treasures of 'edification, exhortation and comfort' lodged for us by the Inspiring Master in the wonderful work of the inspired Servant. To this everything else" was "subsidiary, alike the brief historical and critical introduction and the occasional grammatical discussions. The highest ambition of the interpreter" in each of these Expository Studies was "to bring the reader into closer contact with the 'Celestial letter' itself and with the mind and message of God in it." That does not mean that there was any neglect of those introductory and critical studies which underlie the exposition, but our author always had in view the average reader, who had not the time or the training which would enable him to appreciate full scholarly treatment of such questions. As John Watson ("Ian Maclaren") once put it: "People like their water filtered, but they don't like to have the gravel (of the filter) in their glass." Those of us who knew Dr. Moule's powers often longed that he might give us some great work, which would appeal to the world of pure scholarship and of advanced studies; but who that knows in any degree the widespread influence of his writings will presume to say that this servant of his Lord did not obey the voice of that Lord, when he deliberately consecrated all his powers to meet the needs of the general body of Christian people? Moreover, it is questionable whether he could have found time for such a work of pure scholarship, involving much independent

research and investigation. Probably no one, who has not been Principal of a Theological College or Bishop of a Diocesan see, has any conception of the extent of the calls upon time and strength which are involved in such offices. And, when at Cambridge there were added the duties of a Sunday lectureship and the many obligations which crowded in upon such a man in the spheres of the University, the Town and the Church of England as a whole, it is not surprising that Dr. Moule should have felt that he could best serve his day and generation by using his all too scanty leisure upon such writings as were in the line of his pulpit and platform ministrations.

It is well known that Dr. Moule in both his theological and his expository writings adhered to conservative views. Many of his pupils and some of his colleagues moved to more advanced positions; and it ought to be recorded that their beloved Teacher and Principal showed to them a large-hearted tolerance, which only drew the line at anything that seemed to him to indicate a disloyalty of heart to the Divine Master Himself. In the case of one of his Vice-Principals, it was only the trustful loyalty of the Principal to his colleague which saved the latter from being thrown overboard.

3. *Devotional Writings.*

He published several volumes of sermons, a large number of smaller devotional books and over thirty tracts and papers. A considerable number of his published sermons were preached in the University pulpit or in Trinity College chapel. They are models of what such sermons should be, perfect alike in matter and in manner. I well remember the appreciation with which Dr. Moule's subsequent successor in the Norrisian Chair of Divinity commented to me on the sermon which we had just heard him preach in

Great St. Mary's on "But it is good for me to draw near to God." It was a masterly exposition of the necessity of individual approach to God, not as opposed to, but as the indispensable accompaniment of, Corporate Religion. *Fordington Sermons* (1878) show his earlier style and manner. *Christ is All* (1892), *The Secret of the Presence* (1901), *My Brethren and Companions* (1906), give us examples of his later sermons, the second volume being to my mind of special value and containing the sermon referred to above. I have spoken already (Part I. § 4) of *Thoughts on Christian Sanctity*. This was followed in steady succession by *Thoughts on Union with Christ*, *Secret Prayer*, *Christ and the Christian*, *Life in Christ and for Christ*, *Grace and Godliness*, *Grace and Virtue*, *The Call of Lent*, and many other volumes. No writings have done more in our generation to maintain and deepen true religion and "virtue" in Christian hearts. Under this head may also be mentioned a valuable book of counsel to Clergy, *To my Younger Brethren* (1892). The Bishop was greatly moved and exercised by the problems raised by the War, and by the sorrows and sufferings of countless torn and stricken hearts. Bishop Welldon tells how "after a bad air raid in 1918 the Bishop visited the village which the Germans had devastated, going on foot from house to house and speaking words of sympathy to the inhabitants, until one of the miners who had watched him said to the clergyman, 'Look here, sir, I do not belong to your Church, but the Church of England is all right so long as she has men like Bishop Moule.'" But he did more than that. He set his pen to work, and by his *Christus Consolator*, and *Christ and Sorrow* he brought to many sorrowing hearts all over the land untold comfort and rest. *Christus Consolator* was speedily translated into French and thus reached a still wider circle of readers.

4. *Miscellaneous Writings.*

i. *Poems.*—In Part I., § 2. I have spoken of *Imitations and Translations*, and of the remarkable series of Poems, which six times won for the writer the Seatonian Prize. In 1896 he published *In the House of the Pilgrimage*, a collection of sacred verse, unsurpassed for beauty of thought and melody of words. I cannot resist quoting the first twelve lines of "The Sacrament."

> The Church is silent, the white Table spread
> With ordered elements, the Wine, the Bread;
> The Pastor lifts the hand and speaks the word,
> And lo—Thy Blood, Thy Body, dying Lord!
> So Faith can see. To her illumined eyes
> The scene around puts on another guise;
> The chancel seems a chamber; in the shade
> Of evening see the Paschal board array'd.
> The mortal Pastor here no longer stands;
> Christ speaks the word and spreads His hallowing hands:
> Christ breaks the bread and pours the purple wine,
> And carries to His guests the Meal divine.

ii. *Biographical and Memorial.* In 1892 appeared *Charles Simeon* in the "Leaders of Religion" series, a masterly sketch of that most remarkable man. Other memorial volumes were inspired by filial and parental love. I have already spoken in Part I., § 1 of *Memoirs of a Vicarage* and its portraits of parents, brothers, parishioners and friends, painted with warm and dutiful affection. *The School of Suffering* was a touching tribute to a very dearly loved daughter, who died at the age of twenty-two. It had a remarkably widespread sale and was translated into Japanese.

This and a shorter Memoir of his wife, privately printed in 1915, admit the reader into sacred intimacies with beautiful souls.

iii. *Historical or descriptive.—Auckland Castle, a Popular History and Description*, written during a summer holiday

in Ireland in 1917, is a well-informed and most interesting account of the "stately House and Chapel fair," and of their growth, changes and associations, through more than five centuries. It illustrates happily the keen interest and delight of the writer in other things than theology and edification and episcopal or pastoral work—his joy in all things noble and fair and memorable; his affectionate and grateful memory of the past. The great manor house of the Bishops (it was never really a castle) was the object of his eager study and true affection.

Four lectures too, out of many, may be mentioned as characteristic of the scholar and student, the lover of history and literature and the grateful disciple.

(a) *Olympia*, a lecture given (by request) at that famous centre of the Grecian games of old, in the course of a short tour to Athens and Jerusalem in his Ridley days, and repeated at Cambridge.

(b) *Cambridge and the Poets*, given, I think, in the University of Durham.

(c) *The Poet Gray*, and (d) *My Cambridge Teachers*, both given at Cambridge.

Looking back over this long list of writings (and many more might have been referred to), the thought uppermost in my mind is one of gratitude to the Greatheart, who so self-sacrificingly laid himself out to serve Christian people, wherever he might find them. Many of his writings were more or less ephemeral, and in the course of time will be forgotten, but there are some which, I am persuaded, the world will not willingly let die.

JOHN BATTERSBY HARFORD.

ARGUMENTS FROM THE PENTATEUCH FOR THE FUTURE LIFE.

That the doctrine of the Future Life acquired in Christianity an importance which it had neither in the Jewish nor in the Hellenic system is evident ; yet in the Gospels and Acts the Pharisees are represented as convinced supporters of this dogma, which the later Judaism also maintains. Evidence was naturally sought for it in the Old Testament, where it is not prominent, though beliefs on the subject similar to those held by the Greeks occasionally emerge.[1] In the Synoptic Gospels one of the arguments drawn from the Law is ascribed to the Saviour Himself. It is of some interest to trace the form which this and others have assumed.

We have first to distinguish between the doctrine of *Resurrection* and that of *Existence after death*. The importance is indeed for philosophy, not for devotion : for the beautiful Anglican Burial Service finds no inconsistency between the assertion that "the souls of the faithful after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh are in joy and felicity" and the "certain hope of the Resurrection" when our vile body shall be changed that it may be like His glorious body. If the souls are already in joy and felicity, there would seem to be no need nor room for that change.

The example whereon the famous argument of 1 Corinthians xv. is based is one of Resurrection ; those which were used before the preaching of Christianity seem equally clearly to have been of continued existence. These were the cases of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. In the Fourth Book of Maccabees it is repeatedly asserted that these three after death "live to God."[2] They will receive the martyred

[1] See Madame Novikoff's pamphlet, *Christ or Moses, Which ?* 1895.
[2] vii. 19 ; xvi. 25.

Jews to their bosoms and all the fathers will approve.[1] "Abraham's bosom" was familiarly used in the sense of Paradise,[2] and "to sit in Abraham's bosom" was a euphemism for dying.[3] This was because the three patriarchs were supposed to be feasting in the kingdom of heaven,[4] and "to recline on the bosom" is a phrase which has this association.[5] The fact that God had prepared a city for them was what explained His calling Himself their God.[6]

The assumption then that the three patriarchs were enjoying continued existence after death underlies the language of both Jewish and Christian documents of the first century or thereabouts; and it is assuredly no accident that the evidence of the Pentateuch for survival is found by both the Gospels and the Jewish Oral Tradition in verses which deal with these persons. According to the latter one R. Simai (of uncertain date) inferred it from Exodus vi. 4, where God, speaking to Moses, says: *I have also established my covenant with them to give them* (the three patriarchs) *Canaan the land of their sojournings*. The text says *to give them*, not *to give you*. The argument, if the words are to be taken literally, is quite sound, only it would imply not continued existence, but resurrection to take possession of the land. If R. Simai inferred the former, he must have interpreted the land allegorically, as the author of the Epistle does.

Now it seems likely that the theory of the survival of the patriarchs was not entirely based on these texts. The phrase used in 4 Maccabees and employed in the same context by St. Luke, *They live to God*,[7] comes from else-

[1] Ibid. xii. 16.
[2] Luke xvi. 22.
[3] *B. Kiddushin* 72b (cited by Merx on Luke *l.c.*).
[4] Matthew viii. 11.
[5] John xiii. 23.
[6] Hebrews xi. 16.
[7] Luke xx. 38. ζῶσι τῷ θεῷ.

where, and we learn from Philo whence. He repeatedly finds proof of the future life in Deuteronomy iv. 4, *Ye, the cleaving to the LORD your God, are alive all of you this day.*[1] In the form which this verse takes in the LXX it might be rendered *Ye, the sojourners to the LORD your God, are alive all of you this day.*[2] The word rendered "sojourners" is used by the LXX elsewhere to translate the Hebrew word which has that signification,[3] and is applied to the sojournings of the patriarchs. Philo adopts this meaning in this place, and infers from the verse that only those who take refuge with God are alive, whereas all others are dead. "To-day" he holds to mean in eternity. The Jewish Oral Tradition utilises the verse for a similar purpose, and glosses "to-day" somewhat similarly.[4]

Philo does not separate προσκείμενοι from the Divine name, but the combination did not altogether please the Hebrew exegetes, who indeed ask how "attachment" is possible to One who is a devouring flame. The doctrine which we find in 4 Maccabees seems to be based on an interpretation of the LXX rendering which avoids that difficulty. The verse becomes: *Ye the sojourners are alive to the LORD your God all of you to-day.* In both Christian and Jewish documents emphasis is laid on the fact that the three patriarchs were homeless. Abraham had to buy a grave for Sarah, Isaac's people disputed over a well, Jacob had to buy a place on which to pitch his tent.[5] God gave Abraham no inheritance in the land of Canaan, no, not so much as to set his foot on.[6]

One might be unwilling to believe that a text thus torn

[1] *On Exiles*, § 11. *On the Monarchy* i. § 3.
[2] ὑμεῖς οἱ προσκείμενοι Κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν ζῆτε πάντες ἐν τῇ σήμερον.
[3] הגרים, Exodus xii. 49; Leviticus xvi. 29, etc.
[4] *B. Sanhedrin* 90b.
[5] *B. Sanhedrin* 111a.
[6] Acts vii. 5.

out of its context could serve as the basis of a doctrine wherewith it appears to have no real connexion, but the fact is attested by both the Greek and the Hebrew exegesis. Philo renders the word προσκείμενοι by πρόσφυγας καὶ ἱκέτας, "refugees and suppliants," and deals with the text in a treatise on exile. He calls the proposition "a necessary and philosophical dogma."[1] In the Midrash the text is supposed to be addressed to all Israel, and to imply that it was the Divine intention that they should, like God, be persistent and eternal. The two notions, that the persons with whom it deals are *sojourners*, and that *they live to God*, come from the LXX version; they could not be suggested by the Hebrew. In 4 Maccabees this interpretation is assumed; the Patriarchs, though dead, "live to God." "Living to God" is a phrase which is adopted by the Pauline theology, where it attains fresh developments.[2] Its first sense is continued existence after death, a doctrine which explained the conduct of the martyrs. Without it their action would to many at least[3] have been unintelligible.

Such continued existence is thought of by most nations as repose after labour, similar to the feasts at the end of the day. In the Jewish Oral Tradition there is a statement that the saints in the next world are seated with crowns on their heads, but there is no eating nor drinking just as there is no marriage nor commerce nor animosity.[4] Since the text cited for this doctrine is Exodus xxiv. 11. *They beheld God and did eat and drink*, it is likely that there were divergent views on the first two matters. The crown on the head is suggestive of a banquet.[5]

[1] *On those who offer sacrifice*, § 16.
[2] Galatians ii. 19.
[3] So Yephet Ibn Ali on Daniel iii. 18.
[4] *B. Berachoth* 17a.
[5] Ecclesiasticus xxxv. 2; Wisdom ii. 6-8.

> Hoc etiam faciunt, ubi discubuere, tenentque
> Pocula sæpe homines et inumbrant ora coronis.[1]

The ἀνακλιθήσονται (shall lie down) of Matthew viii. 11 corresponds with *discubuere*, as the *wine* drunk in the kingdom of heaven of xxvi. 29 corresponds with *pocula tenent*. The crowns are supplied by the passage quoted from the Oral Tradition.

The process whereby for continued existence the idea of resurrection has been substituted is traceable in the Gospel records. In the Lewisian text of Matthew xxii. 23–32 in lieu of the word *Resurrection* we find in 23, 28, and probably 30 a phrase which signifies *The life of the dead*.[2] Only in 31 is the phrase *Resurrection from the house of the dead* found. It is reasonable to suppose with Merx that this is a correction from the Greek, which has ἀνάστασις everywhere. The second Gospel emphasises this in ii. 23, *In the resurrection, when they* (the seven brothers and the woman) *shall rise*, where Matthew has only *In the resurrection*, and the Lewisian *In the life of the dead*. Similarly in Matthew xxii. 30 (Lewisian), *For among the dead* (Curetonian *in the life of the dead*) *they neither marry*, etc., but in Mark xii. 24, *When they shall rise from the dead*.

Merx very rightly calls attention to the importance of the change, and by substituting *the life of the dead* for *resurrection* we shall at least be in a position to estimate both the Sadducæan objections and the rejoinder. Continued existence implies that of spirits; and in these the Sadducees did not believe. Resurrection, as described by Ezekiel, does not imply this; in his vision the materials of the old bodies were reunited and brought to life. It might not be easy to find in the Pentateuch any passage which could be utilised to prove *the life of the dead*; but it was not easy

[1] Lucretius iii. 925.

[2] חית מיתא. The form חיה is sometimes used for "life" in the Hebrew.

either to find any passage which decidedly contradicted it. If St. Paul's doctrine[1] were maintained, that death dissolves marriage, an ordinary case of remarriage of a widow would not serve: the obvious answer to the question Whose wife is she in the next world? would be: Of no one. The levirate marriage however afforded a case wherein St. Paul's maxim clearly did not apply: for since the brother-in-law "built his brother's house," death did not dissolve the relationship. The Hebrew and Greek texts of Deuteronomy xxv. 5–10, where the law on this matter is to be found, differ seriously, but each in some way favours the notion of a temporary, in others that of a permanent marriage. To avoid the difficulty which would arise from the former theory –according to which the widow would in another life certainly be the wife of the first husband– the Sadducees imagine a case wherein there are more than two brothers, and the second also dies childless. But the *halachah*[2] infers from the text of xxv. 5 that a woman can contract only *one* leviratic marriage. Hence they are justly charged with ignorance of the Scriptures.

The Lewisian record of Matthew xxii. 24 is as follows: *Teacher, Moses said unto us: If a man die childless, his wife shall be to his brother.* The *unto us*, which the chief Greek MSS. omit, explains the *unto you* of verse 31, which the Lewisian omits. This summary of the law suits the purpose of the Sadducees; further detail is unnecessary. The Greek text does not reproduce this, but for some reason goes to Genesis xxxviii. 8, whence it obtains the formula ἐπιγαμβρεύσει καὶ ἀναστήσει σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, which is not found in Deuteronomy. Obviously the law could only take the form which it takes there (xxv. 5). The introduction of ἐπιγαμβρεύειν spoils the Sadducees' argument, for that word clearly does not mean merely "to marry," but (pro

[1] Romans vii. 3. [2] *Sifre* § 288.

bably) "to do a brother-in-law's duty," which has to be interpreted from the law. Hence the second (xii. 19) and third (xx. 28) Gospels substitute for it from Deuteronomy *take*, but leave the rest, thereby indicating their origin. Similarly the Curetonian reviser of the Lewisian frequently introduces a change without carrying it out to its consequences.

We regretfully reject the suggestion of Merx that a date can be got for the Greek Matthew from the use of ἐπιγαμβρεύειν in this passage of Matthew, because that word is found in Aquila's version of Deuteronomy, but not in the LXX there. The Greek of Matthew quotes not Deuteronomy, but Genesis, and there the LXX has the word. The chronological order of the texts is however quite evident. The Sadducees must have quoted Deuteronomy, since Genesis would not have served their purpose; hence the Lewisian text of Matthew, which has just what they require, is earliest. The Greek of Matthew which has only the text of Genesis is earlier than the second and third Gospels, which correct the text of Genesis from Deuteronomy. We notice however that in the process of transition from Syriac to Greek a wrong quotation has been substituted for that to which the original referred.[1]

A somewhat similar search for the source of a quotation is to be found in the history of the argument which follows. In the Lewisian Matthew it is as follows: *Have ye not read what God said, that I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob? And lo, God is not of the dead but of the living.* The mode of quotation here is similar to that in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the reference may

[1] The substitution of ἐξαναστῆσαι for ἀναστῆσαι in Mark and Luke is evidently due to the inconvenience of saying that the Sadducees deny ἀνάστασις and then making them quote a verse in which the verb belonging to that word occurs.

be to several texts ; such as Genesis xxvi. 24, *And He said : I am the God of Abraham*, xxviii. 13, *And He said : I am the LORD, the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac ; the land whereon thou liest I will give to thee and thy posterity.* The Greek adds (after *what God said*) *unto you*, which implies that the words were to be found in a message to the Israelites, though perhaps originally suggested by the *unto us* of verse 24. The second and third Gospels endeavour to locate the quotation, the difficulties lying first in the *unto you*, secondly in the fact that no text in the Old Testament is in literal agreement with it. Mark locates it in the section of the Bush, Exodus iii. 6, where God says : *I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham*, etc. But this being obviously addressed to Moses, the *unto you* of Matthew is altered (Mark xii. 26). Luke locates it in the same section, iii. 15, but in order to safeguard the *unto you* alters the text of the quotation. *That the dead rise Moses too indicates at the Bush, as he says The LORD, the God of Abraham*, etc. (xx. 37). This verse is part of a message to the Israelites.

It has been seen that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is familiar with the argument for the future life based on the promises made to the patriarchs, and he in effect utilises the same text as is cited in the Gospel ; and whatever difficulties there may be about allegorising the land of Canaan, the world certainly got over them, as numerous popular hymns attest. In the Gospel the argument is not drawn from the promises, but is based on the proposition *God is not of the dead, but of the living.* The third Gospel elucidates this by adding *For they all live to God*, which perhaps comes directly from 4 Maccabees, but indirectly from Deuteronomy iv. 4, the use of which by Philo has been seen. Philo endeavours to find other evidence from the Old Testament showing that association with

God means life, but discovers no text wherein the matter is so clearly stated. Only, as has been seen, the connexion of that text with the patriarchs is based on the LXX rendering *προσκείμενοι*.

In both the Greek and the Hebrew exegesis Deuteronomy iv. 4 is treated as a general proposition, wherein the *ye all* is not confined to the audience whom Moses was addressing. It is noticeable that the word *cleaving* has—at least in Syriac—a grammatical sense which it requires some knowledge of the Semitic languages to understand. In them the preposition *of* is represented by "attachment" or "annexion." In the phrase *God of Abraham, God of Isaac*, and the like, the word *Abraham, Isaac*, etc., is *attached to* the word *God*. According to this grammatical interpretation the verse of Deuteronomy is identical in meaning with the major premise of the Gospel: *God is* of *the living*. It is not, however, necessary to suppose that there is any reference to the grammatical sense; "attachment to God" in the moral sense will serve. In order to use this text for the major premise of the argument in the Gospel it was necessary that the text should be regarded as a generalisation, and this was done by Rabbis who used both Greek and Hebrew.

The process whereby the author of the Book of Wisdom finds the proof of continued existence in the Law is somewhat different. He infers it from "The Story of Creation,"[1] wherein the formula is *Let there be*, and wherein there is no indication of destruction[2] or of a reign of Hades on earth. If then "death reigned from Adam until Moses even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression,"[3] this must have been illusion; death was for the

[1] *αἱ γενέσεις τοῦ κόσμου*, ii. 14.

[2] *φάρμακον ὀλέθρου*, perhaps for כימן אבדון.

[3] Romans v. 14.

wicked, not for the righteous. Like much of the matter contained in Wisdom this doctrine is found in the Jewish Oral Tradition, where the Angel of death is told that he is to have no authority over Israel, and for this Deuteronomy iv. 4 is cited.[1] The author of Wisdom, though he deals with the life of the patriarchs, does not follow up this subject in connexion with them. However, he charges those who deny immortality with ignorance of the mysteries of God,[2] whereby he seems to mean ignorance of the meaning of creation in God's image, i.e. for immortality. This gloss is also found in the Midrash that has been cited. Hence the righteous only *seem* to die.[3]

With the preaching of the Resurrection of Christ a new word was introduced into Syriac theology, which the Jewish Aramaic does not possess—*qyamta*, "resurrection." We have been able to trace in the texts of the Gospels the substitution of this idea for that of *the life of the dead*. The Gospels insist on the fact that the Risen Lord has risen in the body: the theory favoured by modern spiritualists, who group the appearances of the Risen Lord with "psychical phenomena," has little colour from those records. Hence the Resurrection of the Body became a Christian dogma. Yet consistency on these matters seems to be an impossibility, and in a Pauline Epistle "to depart and be with Christ" is contrasted with "remaining in the flesh."[4] In others *being risen with Christ* is interpreted not of anything after physical death, but of moral or spiritual reform.[5]

To devotion, as has been seen, there is no contradiction between these various ideas. Philosophy has often endeavoured to handle the problem, and though it has perhaps

[1] Midrash Rabbah on Numbers § 16.
[2] ii. 22.
[3] iii. 2.
[4] Philippians i. 23.
[5] Colossians iii. 1; Romans vi. 4.

not favoured the resurrection of the body, it has not succeeded in proving the immortality of the soul. Science has of late years tried to deal with the matter experimentally, and has somewhat rehabilitated the Witch of Endor, whose modern representatives are consulted by Fellows of the Royal Society. The author of Ecclesiasticus [1] was satisfied that she produced a message from the real Samuel, and would probably have inferred thence the survival of human personality. Josephus also exhibits no scepticism in his reproduction of the narrative. Probably the Sadducæan view was that the woman was fraudulent. In any case the anecdote was not in "the Law of Moses."

D. S. Margoliouth.

THE MYSTERY OF THE SEALED BOOK.

No chapter in the *Apocalypse* is more generally familiar than the sixth. From early childhood most of us have contemplated, with mixed feelings of awe and wonder, the going forth of the four mysterious Horsemen, and the graphic picture of a world in dissolution which follows thereupon. But, familiar as are the details of this vision, its interpretation presents a problem not altogether easy of solution, and its message is by no means fully grasped. Still less does the strange *denouement* of the opening of the roll by the breaking of the seventh seal, silence in heaven for the space of half an hour, possess any clearly intelligible significance for many readers of the Book of Revelation.

The true starting-point of this most remarkable vision is the presentation to the Seer's gaze of the Eternal seated upon the throne of His glory with a Sealed Book in His hand. Of the circumstances under which the eyes of the Seer were

[1] xlvi. 20.

opened to look upon the things unseen, and of the details of the picture of celestial glory which he was privileged to contemplate, nothing can here be said. The space at our disposal renders it imperatively necessary for us to plunge straightway *in medias res.*

The first step in our investigation must be to determine the interpretation of the symbolism of the Sealed Book. This is indeed indispensable, and is a *sine qua non* to any true understanding of the message of the vision regarded as a whole. The Book would certainly appear in the form of a roll, tightly rolled up, and sealed fast with seven seals, the latter being disposed along the outer edge, or overlying lip. The roll in consequence could not be opened until the last seal had been broken, a point which must be clearly borne in mind as we proceed. The roll is, further, seen to be full of writing, so full in fact that it has overflowed from the front on to the back. It is, of course, implied that the Seer infers this by observing that the very small portion of the outer side which he can see is closely written upon, implying that the whole surface, back and front alike, has been fully utilised by the scribe. The roll is clasped in the hand of the Almighty Himself. These three points will be found to afford a clue to the interpretation of all that follows.

One of the great problems with which the Church of the first century was face to face, probably to not a few it was the greatest problem of all, was that of Divine Providence—the reconciliation of the power of the Almighty with His apparent quiescence, His seeming non-intervention on behalf of His own, who, confronted by overwhelming odds, were involved in a desperate struggle for existence. Might is right appeared to be the order of the day, and brute force, embodied in Nero and his like, was permitted to rage unchecked against men and women guilty of no crime save that of loyalty to Christ. Did God really care? "Why"

or "How long, O Lord" must have been the almost universal cry in Christian circles. To that cry the vision of the Sealed Book gave reply to such as were able to understand.

The book or roll beheld by the Seer was full of writing, writing in itself, no doubt intelligible enough, yet for the time in practice unintelligible, because of the seals which are upon it. Its secret is held fast by Him who is at once the author and the holder of the book. This surely suggests, in symbolic wise, a hidden purpose, an intention in the Divine mind, wise and good but for the present not to be discerned. But though its meaning cannot as yet be read, the writing is in fact existent; that is to say, in the common prose of daily life, there is a divine purpose at the back of things, which in their totality make up what we call history. Though here and now man may not read it, the writing is none the less written; there is a purpose wise and good in all that God does or refrains from doing. So far as the immediate problem of the Seer's contemporaries was concerned, the glorious vision of the Sealed Book in the hand of Power may be interpreted as an indication that the Divine quiescence was not due to carelessness or no concern; and that through the very travail of His people the golden thread of His eternal purpose ran. It is indeed the Father's call for trustful patience, a call which becomes distinctly vocal on the breaking of the fifth seal.

Assuming that the Sealed Book in the hand of God—we may, if we please, call it the Book of Destiny—symbolises the truth that a golden thread of holy purpose runs through the tangled skein of human affairs, we may pass on to the next point which demands consideration, viz., the manner of the sealing. The roll, as already intimated above, is sealed with seven seals disposed in a row along the overlying edge. That means that it cannot be opened, nor its contents got at, until after the breaking of the seventh seal. Hence

the strange happenings depicted as occurring during the process of seal breaking cannot be regarded as contained within the roll, but as the accompaniments of the deliberate, unhurried process which culminates with the breaking of the last seal and the revelation of the contents of the roll. These are the main points which must guide us in our attempt to interpret the vision.

As already pointed out, the seals are very deliberately broken. The end in view is the opening of the roll and the revelation of its secret, the secret of Divine Providence in human life. But this end is worked up to by way of a lengthened process, which step by step brings us nearer to, but is in no hurry to attain it. God will eventually justify His ways to men, but at His own chosen moment, which to us men not infrequently seems long deferred. The series of happenings which we have now to consider are, we once more remind ourselves, the accompaniments of the process leading up to God's revelation of His eternal purpose for mankind, the final cause of human history, if we may so express it. In other words, they are here interpreted as a shadowing forth, in symbolic wise, of certain conditioning factors of human history.

The breaking of the first seal is accompanied by the riding forth of a White Horseman, to use a convenient though not strictly accurate expression. From a later passage in the *Apocalypse* (xix. 11-13) the reader would naturally infer that this White Horseman symbolises our Lord Himself. This view, however, does not commend itself to some of the most eminent among recent expositors of the *Apocalypse* on the general ground that it is impossible to conceive our Lord as being the colleague of the three following Horsemen, and that we are here more particularly concerned with a description of "the condition of the Empire as it revealed itself to the mind of the Seer . . . a vast world-wide power, out-

wardly victorious and eager for fresh conquests, yet full of the elements of unrest, danger and misery: war, scarcity, pestilence, mortality in all its forms, abroad or ready to show themselves." There is undoubtedly a measure of attractiveness in this line of interpretation, though so far as the matter of colleagueship is concerned, that particular objection does not appear to the present writer to be insuperable. For if, as we assume, we are here presented with a mirror of life it cannot be forgotten that throughout the whole course of history good and evil have been strangely intermingled, and together enter into the warp and woof of human experience. It is therefore by no means strange that the Horsemen are not all of the same moral character. More than that, the view here criticised is encumbered with difficulties of its own. If the leading Horseman does not represent our Lord, when or what does he represent? The almost universal assumption is that he stands for War, a rôle which more naturally the Red Swordsman seems to fill. The only way out of this difficulty seems to be by grouping the first two riders together as representing two phases of war, the glitter and pomp of victory, and the horror and slaughter of the battlefield. Some again would distinguish them as standing respectively for foreign and domestic war. In either case the balance of the group is destroyed, for, differentiate how we may, war is represented twice over. It seems therefore preferable, while recognising that the contentions of those who take another view are not devoid of weight to follow the suggestion of the analogy in chapter xix., and to see in the White Conquerer a symbol of our Lord. The going forth of the first Horseman will then afford a precious intimation that one permanent feature of human history will be the presence of the conquering Christ in the world, ever riding onward to achieve new victories. For all the set-back of the last half-decade this has been

throughout the centuries, and is to day gloriously true. As they appear from time to time, the reports of the great missionary and other Christian societies bear witness to the presence and activity of the Great White Horseman in our modern world.

If this interpretation of the significance of the first figure be accepted there is no difficulty about that of the second. The Red Swordsman unquestionably indicates war as another constant feature of history, a foreshadowing all too fully realised in literal fact. Throughout all the centuries which separate the Seer's day from our own probably not one single year has passed without witnessing war on a greater or a lesser scale in some part of the world.

The third rider, the Black Balancer we may call him, does not so much represent actual famine as scarcity, the grim struggle to make ends meet, which has ever been a too frequent feature of most human societies. The daily wage of a workman is indicated as just sufficient to provide a day's sustenance of decent human food. The careful guarding of the articles of luxury may perhaps indicate the existence of poverty and plenty side by side, as may be seen in every great city of the world.

The last member of the series of horsemen, mounted on a livid, ashen, corpse-like horse, is Death, attended by Hades. If this latter be here called the Grave, the picture of this grim pair will become more intelligible and more vivid. As the Ashen Reaper rides forth on his mission of doom he is closely followed by an insatiable monster with gaping jaws, the grave into which his dread leader is ever flinging the harvest of his scythe. It need not be pointed out that the presence of death is one of the permanent characteristics of the history of mankind. There is, however, a gleam of light in this gloomy picture. Universal as the sway of these twin monsters may appear to be, we are expressly informed that

their power is straitly circum-scribed, and extends to but a fourth of the earth—a timely reminder this, that Death's power is partial only, and that that in man which most truly makes him man is beyond the reach of that Last Enemy and his greedy satellite.

The concomitants of the breaking of the first four seals reveal a certain symmetry and orderly sequence from which there is an abrupt departure on the breaking of the fifth. The Horsemen have ceased to ride forth, and in their stead we have a general picture of the things within the veil, though the practical inference therefrom is still concerned with things upon the plane of earth. The picture is profoundly significant, it is pregnant with a message for the time, and more than that, in spite of changed conditions, for all times. A literal interpretation in matters of detail is here obviously out of the question. To think of the souls of the redeemed from earth, before the throne of Infinite Love, breaking in upon the harmonies of heaven with their clamour for vengeance upon their earthly foes is impossible; it would involve, if not exactly a contradiction in terms, at any rate a contradiction in ideas. Nor is it necessary here to point out to how large an extent the form in which the picture is presented has been suggested by the procedure followed in the Hebrew ritual of sacrifice under the old dispensation, and the conception of blood as the seat of life (cf. Lev. iv. 7, xvii. 11). The message of the picture thus presented will be clear enough if the great problem of contemporary Christian circles, already alluded to, be kept well in mind. The blood of many had been shed solely because of their loyalty to Christ; to Hebrew Christians in particular this fact could hardly fail to present an analogy to the ritual of sacrifice with which they had been familiar from early years. As the blood of the slain victim was poured out before the Hebrew altar of sacrifice, so the blood of their brethren who

had died for the faith would appear to have been poured out before the very throne of the Eternal Himself, and from the ground it cried out to Him for vengeance. But apparently there was none to answer nor any that regarded. The cry of many a Christian heart must have been "How long, O Lord?" This then is the answer to that great first-century problem. God has not overlooked, but for His own sufficient reasons He does not see fit to intervene as yet. Until the hour of His appointment strikes it is for His people to exercise patience under tribulation. In more general terms as indicating a characteristic feature of human life and history, this remarkable scene foreshadows the fact that the ways of God to man will, throughout the ages, present many problems beyond the solution of human wit. Again and again it will seem that God ought to take a hand in human affairs, when so far as appearances go He makes no movement at all. This was illustrated a year or two ago, when men were continually asking, "Why does God not stop the war?" or "Could not God have prevented the war?" Every age has bristled with such questions; and so far as our own is concerned it must suffice that God in His wisdom did not see fit to prevent the war, or by direct supernatural intervention to stop it once begun. But He has neither overlooked nor is He indifferent; He knows the true roots of the evil, and rightly apportions the blame. In this as other matters it is for men to day, as in the days of old, to be patient in affliction even when unjustly suffered, and to trust the Great Father even when they cannot trace the working of His hand. The last seal is not yet broken, and the Book of Human Destiny holds its secret still.

On the breaking of the sixth seal a scene of wild tumult and terror is ushered in; this can hardly be regarded otherwise than as a beginning of the end. The time of patient awaiting is over; and, amid the breakdown of every earthly

institution and the general collapse of immutable nature herself, the Eternal does at last, at His own chosen moment, make bare His arm. They who have essayed the methods of terrorism, who have proved themselves adepts in the arts of frightfulness, whether inspiring heads, executive arms, or unfree underlings of cruel policy, are in their turn thrown into an agony of terror. In the whole range of literature, sacred and profane, there is perhaps to be found no such tremendous depiction of utter, absolute, overwhelming terror as that displayed in this wonderful vision. Nature apparently going to pieces, the sky ablaze with portents, the very mountains tottering to ruin—these are things almost inconceivably terrible in themselves, yet now they cease to terrify by reason of another fear so surpassingly appalling that it dwarfs their awfulness into insignificance. With feet winged by terror, not from but to the toppling mountains the kings and the captains flee, if haply, buried deep beneath their mass, they may be hidden away from the wrath of the Lamb! So staggeringly dreadful is this last now seen to be, that as alternatives thereto the things that, under other circumstances, would most affright appear as positive blessings. This awful thing, the wrath of God, is challenged by the finally impenitent in all ages, and throughout the whole course of human history the Lord of Right enters into reckoning with men. There have been times when the mutterings of God's wrath have become more than usually articulate, times during which the collapse of institutions, governments, and nations have in some small sort anticipated the great reckoning of all. Such a day dawned upon the world with terrible suddenness in August 1914, a day of trouble which has hardly yet reached its evening tide.

The seventh chapter comes as a welcome interlude. Amid this world-tumult what of God's people? Their security is

effected by the divine seal on their foreheads. "This sealing does not mean that they are protected from, but protected in, the judgments which follow. They are in the great tribulation, but come out of it without harm." The shadow of God's protection is over His own, and He shapes their ultimate destiny kindly and well, and the song of the Sealed rises exultant before His Everlasting Throne.

Six seals are already broken; but one more remains to break, and then at last the age-long secret of the Wondrous Book will be laid bare, and the true final cause of world-history made manifest. The time is pictured as now at last having fully come—the greatest moment that has been since the world began, the moment in which the Eternal Himself lays bare to created life His own great Father-heart. The scene is pictured by the Seer with tremendous dramatic power; it is perhaps as near worthy of its theme as any picture drawn by human hand can ever be. The reader who has caught the true spirit of the *Apocalypse* is at this point lifted right out of himself; his imagination is on fire; and he seems to stand face to face with the splendours of the Eternal Throne, and the yet more awful splendour of the Enthroned, the Father and the Son, the latter bearing in His hand the Roll, now hanging loose by single seal, and requiring but one touch to be laid open. The song of the Sealed swells ever louder and more grand, and, like the tide of ocean beating against some granite cliff, wave after wave of triumphant praise beats against the foot of the throne, a very tempest of exultant joy. Then strikes the hour appointed by God before the foundation of the world—a touch of the Hand that was nailed to the Cross, the roll flies open, and the deepest of all secrets is made known at last and for ever! In a moment the tempest of triumph is hushed, the victory song of the redeemed sinks into silence, and the voice of praise and thanksgiving is mute.

What does it all mean? This strange silence in heaven, how is it to be accounted for? To these questions various answers have been returned, among which we need only mention "a temporary cessation of revelation" and "wistful and alarmed uncertainty." Though these statements of the significance of the silence in heaven are supported by high authority they seem to the present writer to leave something to be desired. To one who is able in any measure to imagine the scene so powerfully pourtrayed by the Apocalyptist and to reproduce in idea the splendid setting of this amazing episode such answers as these will appear to be at best inadequate and unsatisfactory. If, for instance, the line of interpretation adopted in this be correct, and the opening of the roll symbolises the unfolding of the eternal purpose that is working out its accomplishment through the chequered history of mankind, and is in consequence neither more nor less than a justification of God's way to man, it gives certitude of the most absolute kind. In which case "wistful or alarmed uncertainty" cannot well satisfy the conditions. These latter would be better satisfied by regarding the silence as one of rapturous amazement. Inexplicable and passing strange, bristling with problems of providence as its path to realisation may oftentimes, to our dim sight, appear to be, the great purpose of God, when its true significance is, at His own time, made plain to us, will be seen to be so utterly wise, so transcendently good, so far surpassing anything that man or angel has ever dreamed, that praise itself fails and overpowering wonder hushes into silence the music of heaven itself. It is as though the whole being of the triumphant and adoring host around the throne was drawn into their eyes, and no strength left to them to do aught but gaze. Their silence is surely that of complete mental absorption, the beholders silent because they simply can do nothing but look. It is indeed a wonderful picture,

the redeemed from earth and the sinless unredeemed of heaven alike reduced to silence because their whole strength is absorbed in looking right down to the very bottom of the great heart of the Eternal. We can but faintly imagine what the breaking of that silence must have been, a thunderous outburst of exultant song, the like of which heaven itself had never heard before.

Can we who walk amid the shadows, confronted by many hard questions, and girt about by perplexities not a few, and who, as we thus walk, are making, each of us, our own small contribution to that history which is ever leading mankind onward to the consummation of all things—can we but believe that behind the shadows the Divine Purpose of Eternal Love is ever working forward to its predetermined goal, that belief will make us more brave and more strong, more hopeful and more content. For however hard to understand the lot in life of some of us may be, we shall rest in the assurance that, at the end of the days, we too shall read to the bottom of the Great Father's heart, and, having read, shall in grateful adoration make confession that He hath done all things well.

W. Ernest Beet.

WILLIAM ROBERTSON SMITH:
RECOLLECTIONS OF A FELLOW-STUDENT.

II.

I TRUST no readers of these recollections will imagine that in what I have written I have had any desire to magnify Robertson Smith as practically faultless. This was by no means the case. What Macaulay said of Joseph Addison, also a minister's son, was no less true of him: "A man of genius and virtue is but a man. All his powers cannot be equally developed; nor can we expect of him perfect self-knowledge." The truth is that in all his earliest days Smith suffered from the lack of that discipline in patience and forbearance which is best attained through the intercourse of a large public school. Hence he was often prone to pass sharp remarks on men who were not striving to go forward in their work. Thoroughly conscientious himself, he had a feeling of contempt alike for teachers or students who were not laying out their energy on the task set before them, and he did not hesitate to express it as occasions arose.

Once, outside the quadrangle of King's College, I had to interpose betwixt him and an irate student who had heard some keen comments on his unsatisfactory behaviour and threatened him with violence. At New College he was too conscious of his own dignity to tolerate any open slight that others might seem to cast upon him. A witless man thought that the classroom where he was to deliver a set discourse before the Professor might have its benches filled by affixing an intimation on the notice board concerning the day and hour when this was to take place. Observing it, Smith promptly attached a line with his initials immediately below to the effect that in the College there was "at least one student who was not a gentleman."

In spite of this infirmity and others like it, however, I am persuaded that never before in the history of New College had there been leaving it a student who in character and gifts and preparation for future service could be compared to Smith. For eight long years he had tarried in two of the foremost cities in Scotland, and we all felt that he had received the mantle of "power from on high."

How eager was he, for example, to make progress in spiritual character. D. L. Moody used to say that every grace we could cultivate and manifest formed an element in our cumulative energy and in the influence we could wield over others. Smith had lived on this principle, adding to his trust in God growing knowledge of the truth, manly courage, self-mastery and endurance, brotherly-kindness and cordial love to God and man.

How strong also for his age was his grasp upon all the essential elements of the Gospel. To his eye, the Scriptures of the Old Covenant shone with a glory that many others never saw; and he discerned their fulfilment in those of the New with a clearness that showed him to be a disciple of the apostolic school.

What a fine equipment too did he have for presenting truth to others. Like his father, he was a born teacher; but he far surpassed that fine scholar in his gift of clear exposition and, when occasion called for it, in the power of impassioned public address. This was seen even in small gatherings of fellow-students around the fireside of the Common Hall and, as has been pointed out, it was still more manifest in the Theological Society. It was set beyond doubt amidst the large number of junior students who attended the preliminary class for the study of Hebrew, of which he was the tutor in his fourth year at New College.

Not as yet so fully exhibited but certainly even then already present, was his power of order and direction and

administration in using his own gifts and utilising those of others. What was said of the Queen of Scots in Schiller's drama was true of him: "Everything became a weapon in his hand" for carrying to completion any task that he undertook.

It was inevitable that one thus equipped for the public service of the Church should not have long to wait for the opportunity of rendering it. During Smith's last session in theology in 1870, Professor Sachs, the teacher of Hebrew in the Free Church College at Aberdeen, died, and his fellow-students, as well as the members of the preparatory class and a wide circle of friends, all agreed in thinking that he should become a candidate for the vacant chair. Testimonials of the highest grade flowed into the hands of the clerk of his father's Presbytery from the professors at Aberdeen, at New College, Edinburgh, and Göttingen and Bonn in Germany, unanimously expressing the opinion of Smith's consummate fitness for the post. A complete collection of these lies before me as I write. Since only one specimen has been reproduced at length in Dr. Black's *Life*, one or two other quotations may interest the reader.

Ritschl of Göttingen said: "I have had the pleasure of learning, in repeated conversation, to know in him a man of the liveliest scientific zeal, of many-sided knowledge and of extraordinary versatility of mind." Adolf Kamphausen of Bonn wrote: "I have found in him a very eager and earnestly minded young theologian, who through the trueness and conscientiousness of his character, as well as through the excellence of his talents and acquirements, united with the liveliest interest in science, promises to do really distinguished service." Dr. C. Schaarschmidt of Bonn also wrote: "I confidently expect that, if God preserves his life and health, he will become an honour, nay, a glory, to his native land, in the sphere of intellectual life."

Smith got the appointment by a large majority in opposition to Mr. S. D. F. Salmond of Barry, who had been our Greek tutor in the *Prorectors* Greek class at the University; and soon he had in hand the congenial task of preparing his inaugural lecture as Professor of Hebrew at Aberdeen. At this time he was reading very widely in the theology of the Reformation, as represented not only by Luther and Calvin but also Zwingli. For this last reformer he seems to have had a very warm predilection. A touching proof of this came under my notice a good many years ago, when I was preparing a handbook on the principles of Protestantism. Wishing to read Zwingli at first hand, I had recourse to the college library at Aberdeen, and I soon found myself handling the very volumes Smith had used before. Under certain chapters I found book-marks he had left which were made of papers bearing traces of mathematical problems he had been amusing himself with and also notes in his handwriting on certain passages in them. These had reference to a point in Zwingli's system which interested him deeply. Zwingli held that a special feature of the image of God in man was his capacity for holding direct communion with his Creator. To Smith's keen eye this fact furnished the key to the reality of revelation. If man had been so framed and born as to enter into spiritual intercourse with his Divine Parent, then, in many parts and in many ways, God could communicate His will to him for illumination and salvation along the whole line of his future development. It was therefore very natural for the youthful professor to choose as the subject of his opening address: *What History teaches us to seek in the Bible.*

The lecture had been looked forward to with great interest, and, when it was delivered and afterwards published in pamphlet form, it met every expectation. In my estimate it is one of the very finest papers Smith ever wrote and

ought to be read and pondered by every student of theology at the outset of his course. The basal fact on which he lays stress is "the blessed consciousness to which the Reformation awoke—the consciousness of direct fellowship between the believer and God incarnate in Christ—not an impersonal *unio mystica* such as the Middle Ages sighed for, but such a personal union as there is between loving human souls, mediated by the two-fold stream of God's personal Word coming down to men and man's personal faith going up to God. To the Reformers the Word of God is the direct personal message of God's love to me; not doctrine but promise, not the display of God's thoughts but of His loving purpose; in a word, of God Himself as my God." Surely no better foundation for wise and reverent and fruitful study of the Bible could ever be laid.

Once appointed Professor, Smith threw his whole energy into the task he had undertaken. While not forgetting subjects that had an abiding interest for him, he studied the Scriptures with microscopic care and thereby came to definite conclusions about their origin and structure that were as yet known only to professional teachers of the Bible. This attainment came out in a way he had never anticipated, when he was asked to become a contributor of articles on the Scriptures and cognate topics to the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. The article on *The Bible* proved to be a turning-point in his whole career. Written without the slightest desire to provoke controversy, and based on principles of study and interpretation he had already indicated in his paper read to the Theological Society of New College, and indeed no less clearly in his inaugural address at the Aberdeen College, this article soon aroused an amount of dissent that at last developed into an ecclesiastical storm.

Since I am dealing here with matters of personal recollec-

tion rather than details of general information, I forbear dwelling on the incidents of the commotion or the personages it brought to the surface. It is of more importance to remember that in 1870 the Free Church of Scotland, while claiming to represent the original Reformed Church of the country, was as yet only twenty-seven years old. She had won her remarkable place and power by the intense evangelism and unimpeachable orthodoxy of her ministers and elders; and in view of what was then taken to be a marked tendency to Moderatism in the sister Church, it was felt to be her primary duty to maintain this testimony beyond the risk of suspicion.

On the other hand, absorbed in independent scholarly research, Smith had no idea of the unpreparedness of the Scottish Churches for receiving the results of the deepest Biblical study. Although the title "Biblical" Criticism had been attached to Divinity chairs in Scotland for many decades previously, the words "Higher" Criticism were not really understood, except by those who had been pupils of A. B. Davidson, perhaps not even by all of these. Instead of being, as intended, a name for inquiry into the origin and structure and relations of the books of Scripture either separately or in groups in contrast with the more minute examination of the text itself, such a study was then regarded as pointing to a method of dealing with the documents of the Bible that claimed the right to determine the question of their authenticity and inspiration and worth as charters of Christian faith and practice. Whatever Smith or his friends might say, this result was always pointed to as the sure issue of such investigation. Indeed it is no exaggeration to say that, in the Highlands especially, "Smith" and "Myth" were in this connexion taken to be practically inseverable terms.

In the midst of such a state of thought and feeling it was

inevitable that the young Professor's writings should be brought under the notice of the College Committee and ultimately the Assembly. Into the long tortuous story of the Libels by which the discussion in the courts of the Church was carried on, I am happily set free from entering. I have at my hand now a series of pamphlets in which the Libel was set forth in various successive forms, and alongside these others containing Smith's admirable examination of them. No one who reads them now with an open mind, in connexion with his speeches in the Assembly can doubt for a moment on which side the truth lay. The Professor's replies were full of the ablest statements on the real nature of inspiration and the only line on which infallibility could be claimed for Scripture that the Church in Britain had ever received.

The current idea of inspiration was that it stamped on the Scriptures certain external qualities of accuracy and truthfulness to everything in them set down by the writers. Smith's view was that the supreme function of the Bible was simply to impart infallible instruction on the will of God for our salvation; and his idea of inspiration was that all the Scriptures were so written by men under the power of the Holy Spirit breathed on the soul of the writers in the free use of their own faculties that, when we read them with His Divine help, we inhale His breath into our hearts and so become inwardly assured that we are listening to the voice of God through them. This opinion was really only another way of stating what the Reformers meant by the *Testimonium Spiritus Sancti in cordibus fidelium*.

The hope of victory for Smith's views was never brighter than in the Assembly which met in Glasgow in 1878. I was a member of it and had several opportunities of mingling with his best friends. One evening many of us were invited to dine at the house of a hospitable Glasgow merchant who

was warmly interested in the conflict, and there to meet Smith and his father. To me it was a great pleasure to mingle again with so many clear-headed and warm-hearted men from the Presbytery of Aberdeen. I was deeply impressed by the spirit of courage that animated them. They all seemed to feel that, whatever might be the issue, they were on the side of truth and could look forward to the coming discussion in the Assembly as to a "gentle and joyous passage of arms" at which they were sure to come off well. It was amusing to note their perfect familiarity with the various counts of the Libel. Instead of being perturbed, they looked on these particulars and treated them very much as if they were a set of pet terriers of which they had taken charge. Indeed they often addressed one another by names derived from the order of the points on which they were to speak, such as "Primus," "Secundus," "Tertius," etc. One genial country minister claimed that he had canonical authority for the designation he bore; for was he not "Quartus, a brother?"

Smith himself did not stay after dinner, but hurried off to prepare for the coming debate. His father, however, remained behind and, while most of the guests went into the smoking-room, I had a very pleasant talk with the grand old man in a corner of the library. Very interesting as well as pathetic it was to hear him express his perfect confidence in the equipment of his son for meeting all opponents in the *mêlée*. "I studied the whole controversy about 'the Bible' and 'Deuteronomy,'" he said, "from beginning to end. I have also talked it over with my son, and after hearing again what he had to adduce, I said to him (and here he lapsed into Aberdeenshire Doric); "Weel, Willie, they may say tae ye and dae tae ye what they like; but it is my opeenion, ye're richt efter a'."

Never did Smith speak more brilliantly than in the dis-

cussion which took place in the Assembly next day. His keen blade carved the casques of his opponents with a force and a dexterity never witnessed before. I cannot resist the temptation to reproduce the conclusion of his address in defence: "Moderator, the principle for maintaining which I am assailed is the very principle which makes the Bible a Bible for the ploughboy and the shepherd. Dr. Begg has told us that he is trembling for the Ark of God. There is another expression more appropriate, and that is trembling at the words of God. I trust that I tremble—I trust that I shall never cease to tremble, though rejoicing with confidence and with love—at every word of God, which I take as the absolute rule of my faith and life. But I am not one of those who tremble for the Ark of God. I know but of one character in the Bible History, put up for our instruction, who trembled for the Ark of God: and that was Eli, not the most admirable character in the Old Testament, but a worldly ecclesiastic. Eli did tremble for the Ark of God: but why? Because for him the Ark had ceased to be a shrine of the living revealing Word of God in the commandments and had become a fetish, an idol, carried out as if by its power it could assist the Church in her war against the Philistines. Eli trembled for the Ark of God, and he trembled and perished. But there is no need to tremble for the Bible, because the Bible is safe, not in virtue of those outside things he had looked at, but because it is the Ark of God's revelation. No man need tremble for that; God's revelation is safe." [1] The words as we read them in print seem simple enough; but as spoken with lowered voice and with the feeling of conscious authority, they cut like steel through the mail of his adversaries. Mr. Campbell, of Tilliechewan, who was standing at my side, said that he had

[1] *The Free Church Blue Book for* 1878, p. 128. The only change I have made is to turn the words of the report into direct address.

never heard such a scathing rebuke administered at a public meeting.

At the close of the Assembly, Smith himself seemed to regard the whole controversy as practically settled in his favour. But, alas! this was not to be the issue. First came the Amended Libel, then the Short Libel, with an apparently peaceful reconciliation of opponents. But, as we know, the strife was renewed over some later articles in the *Encyclopædia*; and the last result was that on the motion of Dr. Rainy, Smith was removed from his chair. Of the Assembly in 1881 at which this tragic consummation of a five years' conflict was reached, I was again a member; but as he passed by me out of the Hall before the vote, Smith simply took time to shake hands and thank me for the sympathy I had given him. We were all too heavy in heart to think of anything but the sore loss our Church had sustained. Towards Rainy our feeling was at first very mixed. We shall never doubt his personal integrity or his sincere desire to conserve the harmony of the Church; and we shall always be grateful to him for abandoning the method of conducting trials for heresy by Libel as an effete anachronism. But to the end of our days we shall never admit the expediency of deferring so much as he did to the movement of what he called "the common Christian mind" and the verdicts of "a sufficient number" of imperfectly educated ministers and elders rather than the claims of those who were bound to search for indubitable historic truth.

Many of us who knew Smith intimately were especially anxious about his health. At first he was very much exhausted, but his wonderful vital energy enabled him more quickly than we could imagine to shake off the grievous fatigue. To all outward appearance he was soon as buoyant as ever, and speedily set about the work of lecturing on the Old Testament which had been prepared for him. When

in 1883 he went to Cambridge as Reader in Arabic and afterwards as Librarian of the University, he gave the impression of a man who had many years of service before him. His friend, Sir J. G. Frazer, for example, was able to say later that "the vivacity and energy of his manner—combined with the physical characteristics of the man—the slight, almost puny, yet sinewy and vigorous frame, the eager, expressive face, the high, piercing intonation of his voice—made up a personality which, once seen, was not easily forgotten." Yet this happy condition was not long to continue. While he was enjoying his work and relations at Cambridge, his health began to give way in a fashion never experienced before. For one thing, the work of editing the *Encyclopædia* proved too heavy a burden. He also read at too great a pace and over too wide a field. The words in which Jefferson Hogg described Shelley's interest in books were all too true of Smith; "The rapid and vigorous conversion of his soul to intellect can only be compared with the instantaneous ignition and combustion which dazzle the eye when a bundle of dry reeds or other inflammable substance is thrown upon a fire already rich with accumulated heat."[1] Above all, in the close atmosphere of the Library, he missed the keen bracing air of the North and the liberty of constant access to the hillsides and burnsides of his native shire.

These convictions were only deepened in my heart when I had the opportunity of meeting him again in Cambridge at the Library of the University. The sight of his fine face so marred by eczema affected me painfully; and I felt assured that his holidays on the Continent and the East had only staved off for a time the end that was surely coming on. Moreover, it became plain to me that he retained a constantly vivid remembrance of the harsh treatment meted out to him years before. The iron of that former tribulation was quite

[1] *Shelley at Oxford*, p. 173.

fresh in his memory. His heart was still in the Church of his father and the college at Aberdeen ; and he frankly admitted to me that he found it impossible to forget the men who had toiled for his removal and was still struggling to obtain sufficient grace to forgive them to the uttermost. *Hinc illae lacrimae.*

I was delighted, however, to see that, in the midst of gathering troubles, his wonderful mind and memory never lost their edge. One day, while he was explaining to me the new method of cataloguing he had initiated, and also showing some of the precious manuscripts in the cabinets, a clergyman with a fine scholarly face appeared in the library. "Ah!" said Smith, "here comes Westcott ; I'll be bound that he is bent on some research." So it was ; he was wanting to examine a cursive manuscript of St. Matthew's Gospel. Not willing to leave me alone, Smith called one of his assistants and, taking from a drawer a huge bunch of keys, immediately selected one of them, told him to open up a certain cupboard and take out a certain bundle in a corner of it, and he would be sure to find there duly numbered the MS. the Professor wanted. Westcott was soon seen waving adieu with the treasure under his arm.

One other incident I cannot help mentioning. After Smith's death, the portrait painted by his friend, Sir George Reid, and destined for the Hall of the College at Aberdeen, was exhibited in the Common Room of New College, at that time occupied by ministers up at the Assembly. I was standing before it, gazing at the face with a sad heart, when I became conscious of some one breathing out a soft sigh behind me. This was Dr. Rainy, who halted for a moment to look at the picture on his way to a Committee. He was in haste and only took time to say : "What a keen mind it was!"

Yes! he had a mind, keen and bright as a scimitar . but

there was also in him a noble heart ; the soul of a champion of progress ; the spirit of a martyr for the truth. And sure his early comrades have always been that, when the historian of a later time comes to review the progress of the deepest and most fruitful Biblical study in Britain, he will assign the foremost place in the van to the son of the manse at Keig, who, at the cost of exhaustion and sorrow and ultimately of his life, won and held the bridge of Christian freedom in those fierce days of old.

J. P. Lilley.

PICKINGS FROM THE NEW PAPYRI.

The fourteenth part of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (1920), which Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt have just issued, has no text of a theological or even a literary character. The contents are mainly accounts or official documents, with about twenty private notes which belong for the most part to the third century A.D. But even out of this unpromising material there are some pickings to be gathered for the study of New Testament Greek.

In 1626[2] (A.D. 325) *καὶ οἱ κοινωνοί* (=and their associates) illustrates Luke v. 10 *οἳ ἦσαν κοινωνοί*, and these men are associated with two Egyptians, one of whom is the son of Pudens (see 2 Tim. iv. 21 *Πούδης*).

In 1629[8], a lease dating from B.C. 44, we get the ordinary sense of *κλῆρος* as a lot or holding : *κλῆρον ἀρουρῶν τριάκοντα*, which illustrates Acts i. 17 *τὸν κλῆρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης*, by providing an untechnical, unbiblical literal basis for the metaphor. Judas got "his allotted holding in this ministry of ours."

In 1635[12], dating from 44-37 B.C., the phrase *τὰ κατὰ τὸν βίον* may illustrate *βίος* in the sense of "living" or "live-

lihood," as in Mark xii. 44, *ἔβαλεν τὸν βίον αὐτῆς*, although the phrase is doubtful, as the context might allow of it being interpreted "for his lifetime."

1639[7], with *ἐνεστῶτ[ο]ς ἐνάτ[ου]*, provides another example of *ἐνεστῶς* as = "present," used of a year. The editors date the document B.C. 73 or 44, provisionally.

1641[6] *ἀκολούτως*, meaning "without hindrance," is an almost contemporary illustration of the metaphorical use of *ἀκωλυτῶς* in Acts xxviii. 31, as the papyrus was written in A.D. 68. The same document, two lines below, proves that the Greek phrase about "fulfilling the time" was already in colloquial use, for the contract speaks of a right lasting *μεχρὶ τοῦ τὸν χρόνον πληρωθῆναι*, *i.e.*, "till the expiry of the period." Still further, in 1641[16, 17] *κομισαμένου δὲ σου τὸ ἀργύριον μετὰ τὸν χρόνον*, we get exactly the phrase about a financial transaction which occurs in Matthew xxv. 27 (*ἐγὼ ἐκομισάμην ἂν τὸ ἐμὸν [ἀργύριον]*).

A family contract, written late in the second century, provides us with "a son of Didymus" (1648[19] *τοῦ Διδύ[μου]*); indeed "Didymus" occurs often in these papers.

The common use of *ἐπιστεῖλαι* in the sense of "send a message, or letter" (*e.g.* Acts xv. 20) occurs in a letter of recommendation (1663[3]) from the second or third century. The writer puts in charge of his friend a certain Soter: *Σωτῆρα δὲ . . . παρατίθεμαί σοι*. In the New Testament *παρατίθεσθαι* is used in this sense, but only of commending persons to the care of God. In 1663[11] *διὰ τὸ ἦθος τὸ χρηστόν*, which the editors translate by "on account of his excellent character," is a parallel to 1 Corinthians xv. 33, *ἤθη χρηστά*.

In Philippians i. 7 Paul says that he bears the Philippians in mind (*τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς*). There is a phrase of affection not unlike this in a letter of the third century (1664[6, 7]), where the writer assures his correspondent that all the young people carry him in their hearts (*ἡμῶν ἡ ἡλικία*

ἐν τοῖς στέρνοις σε περιφέρει) out of regard for his friendly nature.

In 1 Corinthians xvi. 3 Paul asks the church to select some approved representatives in order to take charge of the collection—*οὓς ἐὰν δοκιμάσητε*. The verb is used similarly in a third century letter (1665[23, 24]), in which the writer promises to refund a loan to any accredited agent of his correspondent—*ᾧ ἐὰν δοκιμάσῃς*.

The phrase *τι ἀκριβέστερον πυνθάνεσθαι* (Acts xxiv. 20) is echoed in 1667[3], *ἀκριβῶς πυνθαν[όμενος]*, from the third century, and the following words, *περὶ τῆς ὁλ[ο]κλ[ηρ]ίας σου* (=about your safety), recall the lonely use of *ὁλοκληρία* in the sense of physical health, in Acts iii. 16 (*τὴν ὁλοκληρίαν ταύτην*).

In Egypt, even during the third century, there were cases of workmen demanding higher wages. One perplexed employer writes to his partner, announcing that he would not agree to any fixing of terms, *ἄχρι οὗ σοι δηλώσω* (1668[13, 14]). In the New Testament the simple future is once certainly used after *ἄχρι* (Rev. xvii. 17), but *ἄχρι οὗ* more commonly takes the subjunctive. This letter (1668[2] *πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὔχομαι κ.τ.λ.*), like several others in the collection, also furnishes fresh proof, if proof were needful, that *μέν* is not the indication of an anacolouthon in New Testament Greek when it is not followed by any *δέ*.

In 1672[3, 4] (37–41 A.D.) *ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ ἐξέστης ἡμῶν πεπράκαμεν κ.τ.λ.* is a fresh illustration of Matthew xiii. 46.

In Mark ii. 22 *ἀπόλλυμι* is used of wine: *ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται*. Matthew and Luke alter this to *ἐκχέομαι* and confine *ἀπόλλυμι* to the wineskins. But in 1673[16, 17] (third century) *ἵνα οὖν μὴ ἀπόληται* happens to be used of wine.

In Mark xv. 13 *οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἔκραξαν, σταύρωσον αὐτόν* is difficult, for this is the first outcry of the mob, demanding the crucifixion of Jesus. Possibly for this reason both

Matthew and Luke omit the *πάλιν*, although it is possible to understand it loosely, if one is not pedantically strict. Professor Souter suggests that it may be "perhaps an unsuitable mistranslation of an Aramaic word of much wider signification, *further, thereupon*." It may. But is there any need to go back to Aramaic? Might not *πάλιν* come to have the same secondary meaning as "again" in English, *i.e.* "however"? There is a phrase in 1676[20] (third century) which suggests this. The letter, written by a man to a married woman, is "the most sentimental that has yet appeared in the papyri"; the writer suggests that the lady and her husband were not able to attend his boy's birthday party, and, after declaring that he is glad she is happy elsewhere, adds: *καὶ λυποῦμαι πάλιν ὅτι ἐκτός μου ε[ἶ]*. That is, "Still I am sorry you are not beside me."

Another instance of *μετεωρίζομαι*, = be anxious, turns up from the third century, in a letter (1679[16]) from a woman, who tells her mother not to worry (*μὴ μετεωρίζου*) about her, as she is quite well.

1685[15, 16] (A.D. 158) with *τεσσεράκοντα*, not *τεσσαράκοντα*, falls to be added to Moulton's list (*Grammar of N.T. Greek*, vol. ii. part I., p. 66) of instances prior to the second century.

In his *Grammar of the O.T. in Greek*, i. 98, Mr. Thackeray cannot give an earlier date than 191 A.D. for the emergence of the Ionic *νεομηνία* in papyri and inscriptions. Now we have a case from A.D. 188 in 1692[4].

These pickings are grammatical. The character of the papyri prevents any discovery of deeper illustrations. But even in these old bundles of accounts and business notes there is occasionally a human touch. Thus, a man writes to an athletic friend, giving him a commission to buy some articles, and appropriately enlarges the customary greeting: *πρὸ τῶν ὅλων εὔχομαι σε ὑγιαίνειν καὶ νικᾶν πάντοτε*. "Good health to you, and may you always be a winner"!

(1759[4]). Another writer (1772[3]) sends hearty greetings "to your excellent partner (*τὴν ἀγαθήν σου σύμβιον*) and to Julian and to the horse (*καὶ τὸν ἵππον*)" and so on. There is a naïve touch here, which reminds one of the last three words in the Book of Jonah. A third century note (1768[12, 13]) brings up the odd name of *Φιλάργυρος*, and several indicate that human nature has not altered in one respect since the third century; repeatedly a correspondent complains of unanswered letters and urges that some notice be taken of his communication. One man (1765) upbraids a Tarsian weaver for having failed to acknowledge no fewer than eight letters! "Eight letters you have had, and you've never once deigned to write me."

JAMES MOFFATT.

A FURTHER NOTE ON THE ORIGINAL TITLE OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL.

IN a recent article in the EXPOSITOR [1] I tried to show (and I hope not without a measure of success) that there was evidence extant for a belief that the canonical title of the second Gospel had displaced an earlier form, in which it was no longer the *Gospel of Mark* but something more nearly resembling the *Memorabilia of Xenophon*, from which work Mark had taken his model, and constructed the title of his composition. We were quite clear that the *Memorabilia* was a part of the title, for we found it expounded and expanded by the Presbyter whom Papias quotes, and we found the title in process of displacement by Justin Martyr, who talks of *Memorabilia which are also called Gospels*.

It was not quite so clear what was contained in the original title beside *Memorabilia*. There were several possible

[1] May 1920, pp. 334–350.

expansions, as, for example, in the case of the parallel title of Xenophon's works; we might expect the name of the person whose memoirs are being written; indeed we should naturally expect an expansion of this kind at the first appearance of a new model in literature.

Then we might not unnaturally conclude that the literary world to whom the book was in the first instance addressed would wish to know the name of the author, as for instance, in the case of Socrates, the name of the companion who introduces him would be desired; thus we might form something similar to the expression which we commonly use to-day, when we say, Xenophon's *Memorabilia of Socrates*.

In the next place, if we wish to be more explicit as to the contents of the book, it is open to us to explain that the expression *Memorabilia* means Memoirs of the *Life and Words*, or of the *Words and Deeds* of the person memorialised; and we were able to show that there was abundant and early illustration of such an interpretation of the *Memorabilia of Jesus*, and that it was even possible that Luke had some such expression in mind when he opened his second volume by an allusion to the first as containing what *Jesus began to do and to teach*: in which case, if the Acts recalls the Gospel of Luke, the Gospel of Luke recalls the Gospel of Mark, and declares itself to be also a volume of *Memorabilia*.[1]

Then in the last case, we detected a preliminary preposition in the title, taken over directly from the Xenophontean title, where we had in the MS. tradition of the book the expression

ἐκ τῶν Ξενοφῶντος ἀπομνημονευμάτων.

This preposition has no little importance in the discussion which took place over the Gospel of Mark not very

[1] Cf. H. G. Wood in Peake's Commentary: The Gospels "offer us certain Memorabilia of the public ministry of Jesus."

long after its appearance. It is quite clear from the language of the Presbyter whom Papias quotes, that he has undertaken to defend Mark from certain charges which have been made against him. The passage which Papias transcribes is almost entirely apologetic: Mark has clearly been challenged either for saying too much or for saying too little; his authority for saying anything at all has been called in question; he was not an Apostle, no, nor even a disciple of Jesus; not a hearer, in the sense of attachment and discipleship. Why does this person, of uncertain authority, say that his book is extracted

From the Memoirs of Jesus?

Then he has omitted something which he should have recorded; perhaps also, since he is not a first-hand authority, he has made mistakes as well as been guilty of omissions. The position in which Mark's title places Mark is one which requires an apology; and this is what the Presbyter does for him. He assures us that the apparent extracts of Mark are "some of the memoirs committed to writing," but that the Memoirs were really Peter's, either what Peter remembered of Jesus, or what Mark remembered of Peter. Although Mark was not one of the disciples, he was favourably placed for being a reporter of the words and deeds of Jesus by his association with one of the principal apostles. The introduction of Peter may be genuine history, but we may suspect it to be artificial, due to the reflection that the term *Memorabilia* implies, if you take it etymologically, that some one had remembered something about somebody. Either then these are Peter's Memoirs of Jesus, as Justin suggests, or they are Mark's Memoirs of Peter. The solution appears to us to be artificial, as if the Presbyter intended by his explanation to take Mark out of the area of criticism by putting Peter into it. The final conclusion of the Presbyter is that "there is nothing wrong with Mark." His

relation to Peter was so intimate that, given memory, you may trust the Memoirs. As we have said, the Apologetic appears to be unnatural. The suggestion even arises whether Peter had anything to do with the matter at all.

Eusebius makes an apology of a more subtle and convincing character. As we pointed out in the article referred to, he discusses in his *Demonstratio Evangelica* the very passages in Papias which contain the Elder's vindication of the accuracy and trustworthiness of Mark. Eusebius is one of the earliest of Synoptic students, a pioneer among the small group of persons similarly engaged, all of whom make the mistakes in Synoptic criticism which were natural to pioneers in an age when critical eyes were only beginning to open. Eusebius assumes Peter as a link between Jesus and Mark, and then, taking Matthew for a model, he asks what it was that Mark was suspected of having omitted which Matthew has recorded. Evidently it was Petrine matter, notably matter involved in the incident at Cæsarea Philippi, which Mark knew of, and which Peter sealed Mark's lips about; and having shown how Peter's greatest praises are absent from Mark, and Peter's greatest blames are extant and palpable, and how lowly Peter is elsewhere in his estimate of himself, he makes a fine argument about the trustworthiness of Apostles who do not write their own glories, but rather remove them from sight and knowledge. Had not the Apostles done the same thing with Jesus? They had delineated His dishonour: if they had been writers of fiction they would have made the arms wither that struck Jesus, and the High Priest go blind that had condemned Him. It is a fine, almost a noble argument for the reality of the Gospel narration, but it was apologetic of Mark, as well as laudatory of Peter and the rest of the Evangelists. There is no reason to suppose that anything like the Synoptic criticism of Eusebius was in the mind of Papias' Presbyter.

But now let us try whether we can take the matter a little further. We showed that in the third book of the *Demonstratio Evangelica* Eusebius had made frequent reference to the passage which Papias quotes from the Presbyter. For example, after showing that Peter denied the Lord and went out and wept bitterly, he points the moral of Peter's by saying that Peter tells us these things about himself and against himself; you read it in Mark, but everything Marcan is the *Memoirs of Peter's Discourses*. Eusebius knows, however, that the Memoirs are really *Memorabilia of Jesus*, and he asks whether we can disbelieve such transparently honest records without at the same time impugning all Greek (or even non-Greek) authors who have written *Lives and Discourses* of famous men. One can see that Eusebius knows his Xenophon. He does not need to be instructed as to the content of the word *Memorabilia*. We can see that for him, at all events, there was something in the title which suggested the Sayings or Doings (λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα) of Jesus. He accepts the statement of the Elder about Mark's having been attached to the ministry of Peter (γνώριμος καὶ φοιτητὴς γενόμενος), for Mark is said by Eusebius to have made

Memoirs of the Discourses of Peter on the Acts of Jesus.

Here we have struck a fresh vein and perhaps may be able to restore a tiny fragment of the Marcan title. Leave out, for the present, the reference to Peter, and read

Memoirs of the Acts of Jesus
(περὶ τῶν πράξεων Ἰησοῦ),

this is very nearly the same as

περὶ τῶν λεχθέντων ἢ πραχθέντων Ἰησοῦ,

which we had previously conjectured; but the form in which Eusebius puts the thought is illuminating; it shows

us how the title of the *Acts of the Apostles* was arrived at by Luke. The book which he took as his model was a volume of the *Acts of Jesus*, and his own Gospel was, therefore, to himself a volume of similar Acts. The title of *Memoirs of the Acts* (*and Words*) *of Jesus* explains at once the genesis of the title of Luke's second volume on the *Acts of the Apostles* (sc. Peter and Paul), and we have shown that it also explains Luke's allusion to the Gospel as containing the beginning of *Christ's Doing and Teaching*.

The manner of the production of the successive volumes becomes much more intelligible, now that we are able to see St. Luke sitting down to re-edit and combine into a unity a couple of writings, Mark on the one hand and Q (the second source) on the other. It is to these he refers in his Prologue, Q being the αὐτόπτης or eye-witness, and Mark the ὑπηρέτης or servant (as in fact Luke describes him in Acts xiii. 3).

The discovery of the original title of Mark supplies the genesis of the title of the second volume of Luke, for which we cannot, as in Mark's case, produce a classical parallel. The point may seem to be a trifling one, but in this region of enquiry nothing is really trivial. The result is arrived at by straightforward criticism upon existing materials; if we use it as a starting point for further enquiry we may, by the aid of a conjecture, open up a further field of investigation.

Let us then assume the foregoing results, viz., that Mark, and Luke who incorporates Mark, have a submerged title comparable with the *Memoirs of the Acts of Jesus*, which title leads naturally to the heading of the book which we call *Acts of* the Apostles.[1] Evidently there is no reason why Luke should have been the first to imagine a volume of

[1] We may compare the suggestion of the Fourth Gospel, that many more books might be written on what *Jesus had done*, i.e., on the Acts of Jesus.

Memoirs of *the Apostles* in the sense of a record of their activities. Why should not Mark have done it before him? And if there is really a foundation for the attachment of Mark as interpreter to Peter, in the same way as we know Luke to have been attached to Paul, what hinders us from believing that there was a Marcan volume of Acts of Peter? If such existed it would as naturally become incorporated with a Lucan tradition of *Acts of Paul* as the Gospel of Mark became embedded in the Gospel of Luke. The only change required in the hypothetical title of the Lucan *Acts of Paul* would be to replace it by *Acts of the Apostles*, understanding Apostles in the dual as being Peter and Paul. Thus the genesis of the complete volume becomes intelligible just as, thanks to Synoptic criticism, the genesis of the third Gospel has become.

Such a hypothesis as we have here put forward will require to be treated linguistically and historically. We are prepared for a certain amount of Lucan language and ideas, but we shall want to know whether it is possible also to detect a Marcan substratum, in the first part of the book. Then we shall have to enquire into the meaning of the whole book as a history. It is common to treat Acts as the second volume of a trilogy, and to explain in this way the unfinished story and the abrupt suspension of the narrative. It should, however, be remembered that the *Acts of the Apostles* is not a single unfinished story but a pair of such narrations. Peter is left hanging in the air quite as truly as Paul is. He is dropped abruptly as if the Memoirs of his Acts had never taken him beyond Jerusalem and Antioch. If, then, Luke had any intention of concluding his Apostolic story, he must have meant to pick up again the Petrine threads as well as the Pauline, and to carry one of the great Apostles to his consummation along with the other. It is not to be thought of that both of the Church historians should have

deliberately produced unfinished works; if Mark finished the story of Peter, Luke was certain to have absorbed the completion of Mark. Each of them would have had a third volume.

None of this matter is known to be extant. It existed potentially in the memories and registers of the two historians; it is difficult to believe that it never took shape at the hands of either of the artists.

The foregoing speculation must be carefully distinguished from our study of the tradition of Papias and the Elder. It is pure conjecture that Mark wrote a volume of Acts as well as Luke, and that Luke incorporated it. The value of the speculation differs from that of the analysis that led up to it. Its validity must be tested in other ways.

RENDEL HARRIS.

THE ORIGINAL ARRANGEMENT OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

THE problems of the Sermon on the Mount in the Gospel of Matthew have been reopened by the latest volume of Hulsean Lectures.[1] Why is the Sermon where it is in this Gospel? and what was its original arrangement and meaning?—these are questions which have received many answers; either of which, it seems, has the power of starting fresh questions rather than the power of answering the literary and religious problems of the document. The author of the book referred to is under the spell of an antithesis due to one, whose place is with the most revered theological scholars in modern England. The late Doctor Edwin Hatch [2] in his investigation of Greek influences on

[1] Hutchinson, *Christian Freedom*, 1920, 72 f.
[2] Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages*, 1890, 1 ff.

Christian thought and practice set the Sermon on the Mount over against the Nicene Creed: an Ethic in contrast with a Metaphysic; the mind of the Syrian peasant in contrast with the mind of the Greek philosopher. The author of the recent Hulsean Lectures proceeds to build on this foundation with stone quarried whence that foundation came, and to say that the Greek philosopher could not be expected to think as the Syrian peasant thought. It is undesirable that he should do so. He must be himself; and his faith an expression of himself. This is what is asked of the modern scholar, he declares: that he should express his faith according to his philosophical and historical training. For there is one goal for Christian thought. This is in a synthesis of many-phased truth: a gathering together in an organised way of many theories of thought and life which shall issue as Christianity. Since, he concludes, that the great systems of Eastern thought have contributions to make to the growing body of Christian thought. This view is widely held to-day. Mr. Hutchinson bases his argument on a particular document, the Sermon on the Mount; therefore, it will be proper to re-examine that document.

It is a very large claim to make that the Sermon represents what a Syrian peasant could know of Ethics. Value for value it is to be doubted that in this matter Greece is the equal of Palestine. Moreover, there are thoughts at least towards a view of the world, for those who are ready to trace out a theory, which by no means are like the same thoughts in that repository of Palestinian Folk-philosophy, *The Books of Enoch*. Would it be an exaggeration to suggest that in this respect as well Athens does not surpass Galilee? Still, the answering of these questions, one way or the other, will not bring us to the points whether the description of the Sermon on the Mount, as being "the promulgation

of a new law of conduct," is accurate, and also whether a primary quality of the teaching of Jesus Christ has not been lost to view in the argument that it is valid for a Greek or a modern Englishman to think as he pleases, so long as he is realising himself and helping towards the increasing synthetic effort of Christian thought. This second position does seem either to modify away to a shadow or to reject anything like the primary quality of revelation in the teaching of Jesus Christ. It becomes more and more difficult perhaps for us not to elide this quality; for the bright results of the young sciences of the historical and comparative study of religions lead us to agree to cartographical realisations of religious phenomena, to views only of differences in height and depth and breadth in a more or less uniformly progressing world. There are excellent results. Much light has come and is coming from those studies. It will be a grand result if they, with other energies of our time, can lead us to a sincere charity in Christian thought. Yet we should not attain that, nor truth in those studies, if we lose any primary quality in the religion of Jesus Christ. Then, the maintenance of such qualities will depend largely upon the attainment, if we may, of a view of the Sermon on the Mount which shall be nearer to its original use.

When we turn, from the modern attempts to classify a document like the Sermon on the Mount, to the modern attempts to analyse its text, we are met with results which appear to uphold, rather than to hint even implied criticism of, Doctor Hatch's view of the document. Archdeacon Allen[1] has made an admirable digest of this analytical work on the text. He gives, for instance, the varied groupings of the Sayings in the Sermon under their several accepted headings. A detailed analysis will show much better than

[1] Allen, *Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 1907.

a general analysis of what order a document is thought to be. A general estimate of course rests, for the textual student, upon the results of a detailed analysis. Then the Sayings contained in the Sermon on the Mount are grouped under three heads: 1. Anti-Pharisaic Sayings; 2. Jewish Christian Sayings; 3. Sayings couched in Jewish phraseology. The test for such groupings will be whether they are inevitable. It may be not out of place to remark that the inevitability will have to be in the nature of the Sayings. A careful reading of the headings will show that they overlap: since anti-Pharisaic Sayings could be both Jewish (of an advanced or other sect's type) and Christian; Jewish Christian Sayings could as well be anti-Pharisaic and more or less approximately Jewish in phraseology; whilst the Sayings of the third order need not, on the phrasing of the heads, be excluded from either the first or second orders. If the Sayings, by their nature, lend themselves to these divisions then the criticism of them is out of place. We will test them in detail.

The Beatitudes are included under the head of *Sayings couched in Jewish phraseology*; so also is v. 16: "Even so let your light shine before men," etc., and vii. 6: "Give not that which is holy unto dogs," etc. This characterisation is not at least a distinctive one. Under the head of *Anti-Pharisaic Sayings* are included: v. 20: "For I say unto you that except your righteousness shall exceed," etc., where the right of the Saying to be put under this head is allowed because of the specific mention of the Pharisees. Then two short pieces from chapter vi. follow that Saying; v. 1–8: "Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men," etc., and vi. 16–18: "Moreover when ye fast, be not as the hypocrites," etc. It is not so much the obvious sort of feeling that these Sayings are like those in a memorable parable which strikes an analyst as the

omission of verses 8–15. The prayer which Jesus teaches His followers is presupposed by the foregoing Sayings; therefore if this heading is to stand it seems that the Lord's Prayer has as much right to be included under it as the Sayings with which it is related.

The *Jewish-Christian Sayings* are much more numerous. The major portion of the fifth chapter is placed there, that is from verse 17 to verse 43. There also is vi. 10*b*: "Thy will be done, as in heaven so on earth." It does not transpire why 10*a*: "Thy kingdom come," should not be there as well. Another illustration of this method is in vii. 12*b*; the whole verse reads: "All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them: for this is the law and the prophets." If the second member of this verse belongs under this heading, there seems no reason why the first member should not be found by its side. Other Sayings are arranged in this manner. If the classifications do not raise the feeling that they are arbitrary, it is certain that they do not succeed in making us believe that they are natural. The headings do not appear to be demanded by the nature of the Sayings. This classification causes an impression of inconsequence in the Sermon; so that it is not surprising that many of its students have found it to be like a chain of many-coloured and carelessly set precious stones. A comparison of the Sermon on the Mount with the Lukan settings of its Sayings does certainly raise the suggestion that either the two Gospels knew the Sayings in two different forms, or that there is a literary device in the Matthaean handling of the Sayings which has not yet been discovered. This last problem can only be resolved with any helpfulness if the Sayings themselves can yield their own classification. A fresh test then must be found that they may be able to show what kind of a document they compose.

The study of the literary structure of the Gospel of Matthew has received a new impetus from the discovery of how the New Testament uses the Old Testament. The small excerpts which have raised so many problems, either because they have been ascribed to wrong sources or have little apparent relation with turn of thought and incident in Gospels or Epistles or have been noticed to use in the manner of their citation some formalities which appear throughout the writings of the New Testament, have been traced to a primitive Christian document which antedates the earliest of the writings in the New Testament. That document was the first help unto the understanding of Jesus Christ. It was meant to lead the minds of folk to whom the revelation first came, and in the religious idiom familiar to them, to understand something of the content of Jesus Christ. The conclusion seems an irresistible one that He inspired the document, and that it was He who first said: "Moses spake of Me."—He then would have been the first to make him so speak. This document, as well as lending new impetus to the investigation of our sources, is also leading to the revolution of our idea of Prophecy as it is applied to Jesus. This important matter is being dealt with in its rightful place. The most striking feature of this ancient document is, perhaps, its anti-Judaic quality. The title by which it has come down to us is *Testimonies against the Jews*. The study of its use in the New Testament shows how exact is that title. This will be found to be one of the most illuminating phases of the old handbook unto a knowledge of the meanings of Jesus Christ. It is enough to touch in these things concerning it; for they should be matters of common knowledge to students of the New Testament. Another notable feature of the document is that the *Testimonies* are grouped under heads. Some of these are in the text of the New Testament

writings in their proper relationship with the citations they cover. Those heads have in turn manifested how ancient is the ground-form of the heads of the Cyprianic writing known as *Testimonia adversus Judaeos*. The Gospel of Matthew makes large use of the excerpts. The heads of the ancient book have been dropped out. Were they ever in the text of the Gospel? Or have they left signs of their influence upon the disposition of its material?

These questions, and this mode of approach to them, may seem curious in that the Sermon on the Mount is not a collection of Old Testament quotations but a big grouping of the Sayings of Jesus Christ. Now it will be known that the discovery of the *Testimonia* document, and its influence upon the Gospel of Matthew, has settled a long-standing controversy as to what Papias meant when he wrote five books on the *Dominical Oracles* (Logia). These Logia have been shown to be the Old Testament excerpts found in the *Testimonies against the Jews*. Papias went on to say that the *Oracles* upon which he was commenting had been compiled by Matthew. This statement has been reinforced by the findings of those who have done much work of investigation on the ancient Christian book. The title Logia has, of course, been a cause of battle; and chiefly because it has seemed to be just the title which should be preserved to describe a collection of the Sayings of Jesus Christ. The fragments of Papyrus from Oxyrhynchus have been found to bear such a title. The belief in a collection of the Sayings of Jesus Christ is not denied by the discovery that Papias was making reference to a Christian collection of Old Testament excerpts or Logia. It is a comment which is pressed upon us from other writings in the New Testament that the heads under which the *Testimonies* were put must have been associated with particular phases of the teaching of Jesus Christ—that is to say, with His

Sayings—if the exegetical method or Christian prophetical manner with the Hebrew writings is to be associated with Himself. Those heads, and the *Testimonies* they represent, form the text-book contribution to the message in Apostolic preaching. Was there no diviner influence to be recalled when the familiar heads and their material were brought into evangelical sword-play? Was there no lovelier content to the term *Logia* for the minds of the first followers of Jesus Christ when they turned to the Christological way He had taught them? The belief in an ancient collection of the Sayings of Jesus is widely held. The point of search here is whether that collection as Matthew knew it—or is the lead of Papias to be followed and we say, as Matthew composed it—is influenced in its arrangement by the divisions in the *Testimonies* or Old Testament *Logia* document.

It is plain that so far as the Gospel of Matthew is concerned only the Sermon on the Mount can be brought under this test. A large reason would be forthcoming for its prefatory position in the Gospel if we can find filiations with its divisions and those of the book which declared the literary ground-work of the message of primitive Christianity. This reason would be a larger one than that given by Professor Stanton,[1] for instance, when he writes that Matthew's "object in placing (the Sermon) where he has done seems to have been to give from the outset a great example of the teaching of Jesus, before passing in the sequel to illustrations of the other side of His two-fold activity." Without that some other reason is found, it would look as if Doctor Hatch's judgment upon the Sermon on the Mount was the final one and that Matthew's intention was to give prominence to the Ethic of Jesus. What we

[1] Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, 1909, ii. 323. It has not been thought necessary to discuss the various Continental theories.

moderns call Ethics can be, when put back into the original context, a vital phase of the first revelation. Let us then analyse the Sermon on the Mount into what appears to be its own parts.

(*a*)	Matthew	v. 1–16.	Its head :—	*The New People.*
(*b*)	,,	v. 17–48.	,,	*The New Law.*
(*c*)	,,	vi. 1–18.	,,	*The New Worship.*
(*d*)	,,	vi. 19–34.	,,	*The New Circumcision*
(*e*)	,,	vii. 1–27.	,,	*The New "Ecclesia."*

The two divisions in chapter v. make themselves. The Beatitudes and the Sayings which follow after a declaration of Christ's attitude to the old Law could scarcely be arranged in another fashion. The Sayings in the first eighteen verses of the sixth chapter also, which have to do with the practices of the Christian life, find a natural head in the phrase *The New Worship*. The second half of this chapter does not perhaps look as natural as it ought under the head of *The New Circumcision* ; but the naturalness which is asked will be restored to it when an analogue is shown from the Letters of Paul. The seventh chapter could not go under any other head when its contents are examined in the light of the "Ecclesia" Sayings of Jesus in Matthew xvi. and xviii., where especially the latter chapter shows how His "Ecclesia" method of reclamation or shepherding into the congregation is to be accomplished -that is by the exercise of reclamatory judgment towards those who are without. The seventh chapter is composed of the Sayings which in Him are the exquisite energies unto the exercise of His "Ecclesia's" powers.

To remove the feeling that these are homiletic divisions of the Sermon on the Mount, we have only to turn first of all to an authentic text of the *Testimonia* book, the Cyprianic version, and we shall find the several heads embedded in those of its First Book.

(*a*) Quod quo populi praedicti sunt, maior et minor, id est uetus Judaeorum et *nouus* qui esset ex nobis futurus.

(*b*) Quod lex quae per Moysem data est cessatura : quod *lex noua* dari haberet.

(*c*) Quod baptisma uetus cessaret et *nouum* inciperet.

(*d*) Quod circumcisio prima carnalis euacuata sit et *secunda spiritalis* repromissa est.

(*e*) Quod *ecclesia* quae prius sterilis fuerat plures filios habitura esset ex gentibus, quam quot synagoga ante habuisset.

If we take what looks to be the most unfamiliar of these divisions (*d*) *The New Circumcision*, and compare it and the Sayings under it with the Letter to the Galatians, we shall find there reasons for that grouping. For in the fifth chapter of the Letter the ancient *Testimonia* heading is doing its expository work (v. 2) and the teaching which follows is in exact accord with the Sayings of the Sermon (Matt. vi. 19–34). The influence of the two heads, *The New People* and *The New Law*, can be demonstrated as well in the Galatians—compare chapter iv. for the first, and chapter iii. for the second. The fifth head, *The New "Ecclesia,"* is in this Letter also, as chapter vi. ought long ago to have told us.[1] The subject of the New Worship was not before the mind of Paul when writing to the Galatians ; but in Colossians ii. it is to be found in a context which is identical with the material of his Letter to the Galatians—that is to say in a *Testimonia* context. Other writings in the New Testament can be asked to yield the same confirmative results.

Let it be supposed that there were rubrics of the kind which have been suggested, how would these alter our present reasons for the appearance of the Sermon on the Mount in so prominent a position in the Gospel of Matthew ? With these rubrics the Sayings relate themselves with the primary quality of the revelation of Jesus Christ which

[1] On these and cognate matters see the book which is about to be published, Harris & Burch, *Testimonies*, Part ii.

was realised by the primitive Christians—namely, that the revelation was anti-Judaic. Both He and it swept aside the Hebrew standards and practices. He and His revelation were new and uniquely redemptive. He had come to destroy ; and to fulfil Himself. We should find it natural, if we understood these things, to do what Paul is ever trying to do in his large-hearted manner concerning the Person he has heard about and has experienced ; that is, to believe that the New Testament conveys a new and ultimate revelation to man which is in no sense bound up with the Old Testament. Jesus Christ came to surpass that book. Thus the Sermon on the Mount would not be the statement of a Syrian Ethic ; it would be rather the statement of an anti-Judaic message the benefits of which to those who believe might only be realised in the vital context of the Saviour who thus reveals Himself. Most scholars are agreed that an editor has worked over the original Matthaean material. The suggestion arises from this conjectural re-arrangement of the Sermon into its original shape that he only softened the primitive anti-Judaism of the Gospel. The excision of the rubrical notes, and the Woes from the Beatitudes, would be examples of the natural results of such work.

Now if the Matthew Sermon on the Mount was of the nature that has been suggested, there are fresh reasons why the Lukan document of the Sayings should appear to have had other elements or material in it. That Luke has the *Testimonies* which are the *Logia* of Papias has been discovered. That he has in a large measure the Sayings which are in the Matthew document needed no discovery. A suggestion that the two writers are using different translations of a document containing the Sayings of Jesus might meet some small differences in language ; it will not meet the literary arrangements of Matthew and Luke. The anti-

Judaism of the third is as sure as that of the first Gospel. In the handling of the material, the writers are true to their own genius. For whether it was Matthew or Luke, neither could escape the great events in the life of Jesus Christ; and one large element in His death would have to be reckoned with—as demanding its precedent causes in thought and deed which is, that He died at the hands of the Jews because of His personal and literal anti-Judaism. That is not all the meaning of His death, but it is a neglected historic factor in the writings of those who theorise on His death. The Gospel of Matthew moves steadily on from the anti-Judaic Preface to the terrible retort of Judaism; whilst Luke according to his intuitive style breaks up the document which became that Preface and relates the Sayings to illustrative incidents in the life of Him who was the Revelation.

Vacher Burch.

JOEL AND THE POST EXILIC COMMUNITY.

THE subject to which I wish particularly to draw attention is the influence exercised on the post-exilic prophets by the character of the new community in and for which their work was done, as that influence is illustrated in the little prophecy of Joel. The presence of such an influence is of course inevitable; as real as the influence of a prophet on his time was and is the influence of his time on the prophet. Before, therefore, we can appreciate the work of the later prophets, it is necessary to recognise how profound a change was brought about in the conditions and outlook of the religious community at Jerusalem by the renewal of the sacrificial worship after the exile.

The little body of men who reconstituted Judaism round the temple had not come together and did not continue together on the basis of being a nation. This does not simply imply that they had ceased to possess a king or to hold independent authority, and were now subject to the Persian Empire. It also implied that, while the men who gathered round Jerusalem were all Jews, they did not find themselves there on the mere ground of being Jews by race. Whether the men gathered together from Judæa and Northern Israel, or left their homes in Babylon to return from exile, they came definitely because they cared greatly about their religion, its institutions and its future. They came, not as Jews, but as Jews who believed that the continuance of their faith demanded the restoration of the temple, and who were prepared to make the necessary sacrifices for its restoration

Many Jews by race had no share in the effort. Some of the inhabitants of Judæa were unwilling to disturb their relations with the tribes which had settled on the vacant land, and preferred to continue the *status quo*: some of the exiles in Babylon elected to remain where they were, either because they were attracted by the life of the new country, or because they had found the synagogue worship sufficient for their religious life, and believed they could continue Jews without a temple; others would fain have returned to the land of their fathers but could not. Hence, as a matter of fact, all the men who joined in the effort were there, and continued there, because they were Jews, not merely by birth, but by conviction. Since they had separated themselves from their heathen neighbours and even from their fellow Jews because of their religious convictions, they had accepted their ancestral religion in a wholly new way. They held it now, no longer because they had been born into it, but because they had affirmed their belief in it and had sacrificed something for this belief.

Further, the religion which they had thus chosen was in certain broad lines the prophetic religion. The men had broken with the gross forms of heathenism, and the coarser Baal worship had no attractions for them any more. Yahweh had ceased to be conceived by them as the God of Israel; He was the God of the whole earth, who had a moral character which He manifested in all His deeds, and who, in particular, had a moral purpose which He was free enough and powerful enough to assert in the world which He controlled. As such, He was recognised to be different in His nature from the gods worshipped by the other nations: and the men had come to recognise that, since their worship must befit Him to whom it was offered, it must be as distinctive as He. It is true that their religion was the prophetic religion with grave and far-reaching limitations, but to trace

these is a difficult and debatable question; and it is at least possible that the limitations were no graver nor further-reaching than the compromise all religion enters into, when it ceases to be the possession of a few elect souls and becomes the inspiration and the guide of a community.

This religion was at once made more dear and more limited through the fact that they had thus reasserted it for themselves. It was no longer their faith, merely because they had inherited it by old tradition, but because they had submitted to its appeal and had sacrificed and were sacrificing a great deal for its sake. At the call of the faith some were breaking ties which they had formed in Judaea, others had forsaken the homes they had made in Babylon. They learned afresh the worth of the thing for which they surrendered much through the act of surrender. But further, men came to love, not merely their faith, but its outward symbols with a new devotion, and so came to give these a new, even a perilous, significance. Jerusalem and the temple and the sacrificial ritual were the matters connected with their faith, which their fathers had suffered to lie uncared for and neglected in Judaea; these were the things which they could not have in Babylon and for which they craved. Because they had set their hearts on and had sacrificed much for these means of devotion, the outward means became invested with a new value, and might end in being regarded as essential to the faith itself.

Patriotism added its own charm to these outward forms of the religion. In days when Israel had neither king nor independence, Jerusalem and the temple took the place of the flag.

Perhaps the nearest analogy to the physical and mental condition of the little community is to be found by thinking of it as a Zionist settlement, which may elect to live in Palestine under the suzerainty of Great Britain. The Jews

who shall return will return because of their faith, will be held together by a common faith, will be marked off from the Arabs and Turks and Syrians of the country by their faith. And the faith which they will have asserted to themselves in a new way, and by the assertion of which they have separated from even their fellow Jews, they will hold differently from the way in which they held it before, and probably with more than a shade of difference from the way in which other Jews continue to hold it.

This was the community to which Joel had to preach. He did not do his work *in vacuo*, nor develop his religious message in the quiet of a study. He preached and taught among a group of women and men, drawn from very different surroundings, who had to build some hasty shelter for the faith which was their life, and who had to live and define their relations to a world of Edomites and Arabians and Philistines uncertain and jealous of their ambitions and purposes. The fact that the situation of the new community was unparalleled in the history of Israel inevitably changed the character of the message it needed.

The first necessity of such a body of men so placed is to say with perfect clearness what it is and what it stands for, and so to make equally clear who compose its members. Only those who share its faith can appreciate its privileges and have a right to fulfil its duties. Hence Nehemiah begins to build a wall, which, like every wall, shuts in those who belong to the faith and shuts out those who do not. The legislators refuse the help of men who are not like-minded. No one has a right to build the temple except the men who believe in the things for which the temple stands, for the thing you build depends far less on the money than on the ideals which the givers contribute.

These, of course, are matters of legislation with which Joel, as a prophet, has nothing directly to do; it is not his

business to frame a law. But with the situation which those acts of legislation imply and with the purpose which these demands were framed to fulfil, he has very much to do. He has to speak to men who are face to face with this primary need of their infant community, and he has to supply them with their ideals. He does this by saying who are sharers in the common salvation the elect. He says this in his own way by declaring that a feature of the consummation of all things is to be the outpouring of the Spirit of God upon the Jews and upon the Jews alone[1] (iii. 1 f.). He repeats it, when he predicts that at the consummation "in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there shall be those that escape and among the remnant whom the Lord may call" (iii. 5). That gives the principle which informs and determines the acts of the legislators. The elect consist of the men who have committed themselves to the faith in its new demands and fresh sacrifices, and of those among the dispersion who are loyal in heart to its principles, though prevented by circumstances from putting actual hand to the good work.

This attitude is generally described as the exclusiveness which specially marks later Judaism, and is regarded and appealed to as an evidence of how Judaism never shook off the limitations of its national origin. "Being fundamentally a national religion, it could never include or even desire to include the world." But what such a position ignores is that, so long as Judaism remained the religion of a nation, it was not exclusive. Only when Judaism became the deliberately chosen faith of a body of women and men who constituted themselves round their faith, did it become exclusive. Judaism under its kings had no scruple about borrowing

[1] That Joel meant the outpouring of the Spirit to be confined to the Jews is clearly proved by the fact that its furthest extension is, not to the aliens, but to the slaves and slave-girls of Judaism. That his countrymen so understood his words is clear from the surprise shown by the early church at the Spirit being extended to the Gentiles (Acts x. 45).

materials and artificers in order to build its temple (1 Kings vii. 13 ff.); the temple, when it was first built, must have been crammed with Phœnician symbolism. It was post-exilic Judaism which refused all assistance from Sanballat and the kindred Samaritans. Early Judaism had no difficulty about acknowledging that the founder of its faith was the son-in-law of a Midianite priest (Exod. ii. 16 ff.). It was the new Judaism which declared that intermarriage with heretics was impossible (Ezra x. 10 ff.).

The legislation shows the entrance of a new exclusive spirit into the attitude of the community, so soon as it constituted itself on the basis of its religion: and this spirit was taken from the prophetic religion. It was from the prophetic religion, not from the national, that the new temper arose. Hosea, the most spiritual of all the prophets, is also in some respects the most particularistic. Among all the pre-exilic prophets Hosea presents an ideal of what constitutes the essence of religion, which is most free of historical and national elements and so most capable of being made the basis of a world religion. For he sees religion to consist in self-surrender: according to him Yahweh demands nothing less and can ask nothing more. Now it is also with Hosea that the conception of the גּוֹיִם as גּוֹיִם makes its first appearance in Hebrew religion. Where Amos pictures the vivid, concrete life of the separate nations holding a relation to Yahweh, Hosea sees a grey mass of heathenism which lies outside. If any one enters into relation with it, he simply disappears. The prophet's slight sketch of a renewed world does not even count the nations of sufficient significance to deserve judgment. Now these two positions belong intimately together. Hosea's simple conception of what constitutes religion is at the same time so profound and far-reaching that to him religion transforms everything in the community which accepts it. For Israel to belong to

Yahweh means that all its national life and the institutions which embody and sustain its life must bear the stamp of the faith to which it owes its distinctive existence. It has ceased to be its own and must show in all its characteristic acts the character of Him to whom it now belongs. Hosea's particularism is based, not on his nationalism, not on his interest in Israel as a nation, but on his religion, on his conviction that religion makes all things new in those who accept its obligations and its inspiration.

The community among which Joel worked and to which he spoke had devoted itself anew to Yahweh in a great act of self-surrender. It had accepted His will as its law, and had made His service the centre of its life. Therefore it was different from all the other nations. To be sincere with itself and with its world, it must say how different it was from the ordinary life of the world in which it was living. Because it was already separated inwardly, it must proceed to separate itself outwardly. It stood for the faith, and for the sake of the faith it must seek to say what this implied. To mark itself off from its world was a sign of courageous sincerity, and the deed was the expression of an ultimate religious truth, viz., that the religion which is held and for which it had made its great sacrifice made every value in the world different. Therefore, when Yahweh brought in the consummation and asserted His purpose in the world and made clear the ultimate realities and values, He must acknowledge the fact that the community which had stood for these things was in a different relation to Him from the relation which was occupied by all the rest of the world.

The exclusiveness which is so strong a characteristic of all later Judaism has not a national, but a religious source. Because it has a religious source it came into existence when the community constituted itself on a religious basis, and it has defied all the varying fate which history had in store for

the nation. If it had been born out of nationalism, it would have been strong so long as Israel was a nation, and would have waned with the loss of national existence. Because it was born out of religion, it asserted itself most strongly in the community which came into existence and continued through its religion. It is easy, of course, to judge the methods which Judaism took in order to maintain this ultimate religious truth and the ideal of the prophets who gave a spiritual basis to these methods; but it is hardly just to call it anything other than the assertion of a religious truth or to ignore that the real question which it faced and failed to answer has baffled other minds.

Thus everyone recognises that Christianity is a universal religion and never had a national basis, and everyone acknowledges that in its inception it was a singularly spiritual religion. Yet, no sooner has the institution which organises itself round this religion and undertakes to be its representative before the world found its feet and recognised that it must do its work, not *in vacuo* but in the centre of Neoplatonism and paganism and Stoicism, than it finds itself compelled to declare who are capable of sharing its great hopes and worthy to undertake its great duties. It must affirm the religious truth that to enter into a real relation to Jesus Christ makes a difference before which all the other differences pale, and which has an absolute value. Because it has an absolute value, this difference which the relation to Jesus Christ makes will be affirmed by Almighty God when He holds His final assize. Accordingly, no sooner has the great Church come to self-consciousness and to full strength than it proclaims "extra ecclesiam nulla salus." The elect in the consummation shall be all who are found in Rome with a scattered remnant of such as have not obstinately resisted conviction and whom it may please God to call. Somehow, the pronouncement sounds curiously like "in Mount Zion

and in Jerusalem there shall be those that escape and among the remnant whom the Lord may call." Being so curiously alike, the two utterances may owe their origin to the same religious root.

The existence of a community holding certain common convictions changes every outlook, the fact that this community stands, however clumsily and imperfectly, for an ideal modifies subtly all the valuations and especially shifts all the emphases. Amos fronts the world of his day and declares that, because it is morally rotten, Yahweh cannot delay its doom any more. But no sooner has he said this than he turns swiftly on his fellow-Israelites to declare that the coming doom must begin with them. They have been counted worthy of being received into a special relation to Yahweh, and they have utterly failed Him. Therefore, when He makes bare His mind about the world and lays bare the ultimate values, the doom must begin with them. Judgment must begin, where privilege and opportunity have been most liberally given and most patently wasted.

Joel fronts the world of his time, and he also speaks about the judgment of the nations as at hand. They shall be brought down into the valley where Yahweh holds His great assize[1] (iv. 2), but they shall come armed to oppose His righteous and sovereign will (iv. 9 ff.), for they are the heathen in no intimate relation to God. And there Yahweh in His judgment shall condemn them, primarily for their offences against Israel (iv. 2 f.). In that great day of decision Israel shall itself be secure.

The contrast is unmistakable. Both prophets represent Yahweh as having the power and the right to judge the

[1] To look for the valley of Jehoshaphat in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem seems to me waste labour. Joel coins a word to express an idea, and changes the valley of Yahweh's judgment into the valley of decision (iv. 14), as if to emphasise that it is the idea and not the place which he means.

whole world. But, while Amos fixes the judgment on sins against humanity and makes it begin with Israel, Joel bases it on sins against Israel and regards Israel as immune from its doom. This contrast, which is so clearly marked in Amos and Joel, is not confined to these two, but extends over the periods, pre-exilic and post-exilic, to which the prophets belong. Broadly speaking, it may be said that the pre-exilic prophets agree that the divine judgment, which is the divine self-manifestation, must begin in Israel: the post-exilic prophets pronounce that it shall begin from Israel.

That there is a difference every one will allow, and that the pre-exilic attitude implies a keener sense of the moral character of Yahweh has frequently been acknowledged. But the question has not been sufficiently urged as to how the change came about, what produced the altered attitude, and why it seems to have come about in connexion with the exile. Was there anything in the exile which dulled the moral sense of the prophets, or must we account for it by saying that the post-exilic community was largely made up of humble and ignorant men? The latter explanation has an ugly flavour of religious snobbery about it, and ignores the patent fact that Amos, who initiates the sharper moral denunciation, was a peasant of the peasants. Now, while it is true that the new attitude is in its full form coincident with the return from exile, its preparation is already shadowed forth in the Book of Ezekiel. The discourses of this prophet are clearly divided into two sections. The earlier half were uttered while Jerusalem was still standing, before the conquest by the Babylonians, and, moving entirely in the earlier circle of ideas, these predict sharp and heavy judgments which are to fall primarily on Israel because of its sins. The later half, on the other hand, contemplate an Israel which shall have learned from its heavy discipline and shall have accepted the obligations of Yahweh's law. Jerusalem,

which its God had forsaken and had thus left to the mercy of the invader, shall then see Yahweh's return to dwell in the midst of His reconciled people. And this Jerusalem, so reconstituted with such a guarantee, shall be immune on the great day of the divine consummation. It is difficult to believe that the mere fact of the collapse of Jerusalem produced a change in the prophet's moral tone, and turned the edge of his ethical perception.

Joel saw a community constitute itself through a great act of self-forgetfulness on the basis of devotion to religion. He saw a body of men who acted in the interests and at the dictates of their faith, and he idealised the little community in the light of what constituted its *raison d'être*. It is possible that he knew perfectly well that the individual men, who formed the community, were what the individual men in all the communions are, very imperfectly sanctified. But the community, the new Israel, constituted on the basis of loyalty to Yahweh, held together in the hard struggle for existence in barren Judæa by passionate devotion to an ideal and a great hope, remained a beautiful and eternal thing to him. It stood for the eternal values, and, when Yahweh reaffirmed these and set them on high before a world which spurned them, He would not forget the Israel which had given in its allegiance to them, when they were rejected of other men.

I suppose we have all attended Convocations or General Assemblies or Committees where devout men think over the condition and plan for the well being of the Church of Christ. And, when difficulties have been measured and plans have been proposed to meet them, some good man has risen to say that what is most needed is an outpouring of the Spirit of God on the present generation. What such a man counts possible and humbly desires is an intervention of God direct and convincing, in His world. Only God can set His world

right, and, when He manifests Himself, it will be right. But the implication of the aspiration and prayer is that, when God sends His Spirit, He will at once fulfil the work and acknowledge the effort of the Church as at present constituted. Its message will instantly find willing hearers, its empty coffers will be replenished, its shrunken mission funds will be abundant, its colleges will be filled with eager students, its machinery will all move as if on oil. Yet it is at least possible that, when God manifests His mind and endows men with His Spirit, judgment might begin at the house of God. And, if the Church were disloyal to its Head, the effect of the divine intervention would be to divert men's money to worthier ends than its funds, and to empty all its colleges, sending the students to places where the truth was loved and taught. Such a man knows perfectly well that the Church consists of men, many of whom are only nominally attached to its great ideals, or prepared to answer its supreme claims, all of whom are blundering, sinful men. But he idealises the Church, because it stands before the world for the society of those who have cast in their lot with the Crucified. Before him floats a vision of the Church as a spiritual agency, wholly devoted to the ends of God, so thoroughly identified with His cause as to appear almost indispensable to it. When God manifests Himself to His world, He will manifest Himself through it.

That is how Joel is thinking about the little community at Jerusalem. He has not necessarily come to think of Yahweh as less quick to condemn all failure to retain faith in spiritual realities, or as less identified with the demands of righteousness and truth. But he has seen a body of men, which has constituted itself on the basis of a definite act of self-surrender to its faith and which is building its hasty walls of stone and theory to frame a shelter for truth in the pitiless world of its time. In an untoward generation these men are to him the

representatives of that higher morality and of that spiritual life which Yahweh is about to manifest in His day, which indeed it is the purpose of His day to make manifest. Accordingly, when the spiritual and moral realities which are the basis of all life are brought to full light and given their just emphasis, one result will be to vindicate the community which sacrificed so much in order to assert these things. These men shall come to their own through the act by which Yahweh vindicates the truth for which they have stood, and so vindicates them as its bearers and protagonists.

Such a position runs the grave risk of leading to Pharisaism, which Jesus seems to define as the conviction that God must agree with His official representatives. But later Judaism did lead to Pharisaism, and Pharisaism is the disease of a spiritual religion.

One inevitable result of the post-exilic community having come into existence, not on the basis of its nationality but on the basis of its faith, was to give a new value to the acts and symbols which embodied the faith. The return from exile gave a more prominent place in Jewish religion to the temple and the sacrifices. The temple ceased to be the royal chapel, and the expenses of the sacrifices were no longer defrayed by the king: these passed out of the charge of the head of the nation into the control of the religious leaders. But the value of these religious symbols was more powerfully emphasised, because they were precisely the factors in their religion which the men of the return declared by the return to be useful or even necessary to their religious worship. Some of the Babylonian diaspora may have been in the habit of sacrificing on alien soil;[1] some in Egypt built

[1] When Ezra, finding his company to be scarce of Levites, sent messengers to Iddo at the "place" Casiphia and secured Levites and Nethinim through Iddo's help (Ezra viii. 15 ff.), the act suggests that Levites were known to be at Casiphia, and that the מָקוֹם was no ordinary place, but a shrine for worship.

a temple and used it; others, following Jeremiah's great leadership, may have learned to worship Yahweh without any sacrifices. But the men of the return rebuilt the temple at Jerusalem, because they needed this outward symbol and means of worship, and they made it more indispensable through their act. The sacrifices and festivals were now acts which the community carried out as the expression of their religion, through which they were distinguished from the rest of the world in which they lived, and by which they realised their unity with one another and their communion with their God.

Hence Ezra recodified the law. His work served admirably the immediate needs of the hour, for he gave a legal form and a clearer recognition to those elements in Israel's religion which the community had sacrificed so much to maintain. But his work made it fatally sure that Judaism could never widen into a universal religion. For he completed what Deuteronomy had begun: he made the historical and local elements of the Jewish faith essential. Not the universal and human, but the historical and Jewish side of his people's religion was seized and stereotyped.

Again Joel does not legislate: that is not his business. But he is living in and preaching to a community which has rebuilt its temple and is offering sacrifice there as an expression of its devotion to the God of its fathers. He inevitably recognises their sacrifices in a way in which the earlier prophets could not, for the simple reason that the sacrifices of his time *are* different from those of the pre exilic prophets.[1]

[1] It is not possible here to enter into the vexed question of the attitude of the pre-exilic prophets to the ritual service. But I do not personally think that sufficient weight is laid on the profound difference between the purified ritual of Judaism and the earlier form, or sufficient account taken of the extent to which prophetic teaching changed the emphasis in the ritual. Ritual is exactly that form of religion, the value of which depends on the attitude of the worshipper. And the attitude is not supplied by the ritual in itself, but by the worshipper who uses it. Thus Hosea's con-

Hence the threatened cessation of the daily sacrifice in the time of the locust-plague seems to him a grave feature. It is no more than a serious feature in the situation, for he makes the climax of the locust plague to consist in the starvation of the people (i. 9–12), not in the cessation of the תָּמִיד. And when he speaks of the restoration of the land (ii. 25), and puts a hymn of thanksgiving into the mouths of the grateful community (ii. 21–24), he says nothing about the sacrifices and concentrates attention on the fact that the people shall be able to live through the bounty of its God. The cessation of the תָּמִיד is only a feature in the dislocation and distress of his time, but it is a feature and has become a feature worthy the attention of a prophet.

The reason is not far to seek. The sacrifices offered at Jerusalem had no longer much in common with the sacrifices offered on the בָּמוֹת to the Baalim, either in place or in spirit; they were practised for the distinct uses of the Jewish religion. For men to neglect them was to run the risk of losing an opportunity of making clear to themselves that they for their part worshipped Yahweh. For men devoutly to practise them was to keep a perpetual reminder of how they had vowed themselves to the worship of Yahweh. The neglect of them also implied the loss of one great means of quickening the close bonds of fellowship which knit together men who perform a common worship. When the

ception of religion as consisting in self-surrender to God admits of a place for sacrifice in a way in which Amos' harshly ethical ideal does not. He who surrenders himself to God may well use the surrender of his cattle as the emblem of the spiritual reality. But the moment one construes ritual and sacrifice from this point of view, one approaches the altar with his offering as a gift. The more this idea of sacrifice as a gift, an acknowledgment of a debt and a self-surrender, penetrated the minds of the worshippers, the more it dislodged and drove into the background such conceptions of the purpose of sacrifice as are present in the earlier ideas common to Israel and its heathen neighbours, such ideas as W. R. Smith brings out in his *Religion of the Semites*. Sacrifice then becomes a new thing, and a prophet must approach it differently. It is capable of being construed ethically and spiritually.

men sacrificed, they realised their brotherhood, not as Jews, but as devotees to their faith.

At a later date another infant community arose in the same city of Jerusalem. They too were inheritors of a great past, for they were mostly Jews and they carried into their new religion the ideals and many of the practices of their old faith. They had the advantage of holding their faith in such a fashion as made it capable of appealing to man as man: but they too were not framing their ritual for a universal religion *in vacuo*; they were seeking to build it up in the midst of the clashing ideals and opposed moral systems of Judaism and Rome and Hellenism. Conscious as they were that they held something which was wholly their own and that through it they had a contribution to make to the world's life, the men were eager to discover and to maintain everything which reminded them how unique their life was, and how strong were the bonds which united them to it and through it to one another. And so it is written about them that "they continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." What did the breaking of bread mean? Where did they get their rubric as to its purpose? How did they construe the eucharist? What prayers did they use? All these things are uncertain, but their new-born ritual was as vital to them as their sense of victory through Jesus Christ, and their new moral life in Him. Indeed the two were one, united by subtle links and helping each other constantly in the practical affairs of life.

The infant community after the exile had come together under the pressure of religion and to serve the purposes of religion. Some of their ritual came to them as an inheritance from their past; but none of it was unmodified by the prophetic voices and historical discipline of that past, and all of it was subtly changed, since they had anew accepted it

in their act of surrender. Everything which embodied and expressed their communal faith took on a new value. It was theirs in a new way, not because it was ancestral, but because they had chosen it to be the support of their inward life. A prophet can admit and acknowledge the power of ritual, because the ritual can be recast to express and sustain the life of the spirit. But, because he is a prophet, Joel gives the sacrifices only a secondary place. They are only a means by which the community can be quickened and guided. They are not to him, as they became to later Judaism, the end for which the community exists. The life of the community is the bigger thing, and its continuance is that for which men are to give thanks to God who has maintained it.

Where Joel seems to come nearer the idea of the ritual as valuable in itself and not merely valuable as an expression and support to the religious life is in his treatment of the fast for which his book in its earlier half calls. Evidently he thought that the plague of locusts might be but the forerunner of a greater event, viz., the day of the Lord. Evidently also he feared that the day of the Lord might come upon the people like a thief in the night, taking them unprepared in their sins. Accordingly he urges the priests to proclaim a day of humiliation and fasting (ii. 15 ff.), and calls upon the people to take part in it with one heart and mind (i. 14). But, as Duhm and others point out, he specifies no definite sins which demand this act of repentance and emphasises no public vices which are threatening a breach with Yahweh and call for humiliation. Amos and the earlier prophets are extraordinarily definite in the detail of the sins which are bringing down doom upon the kingdom, and call upon men to depart from these. Joel, on the other hand, is vague; he enters into no details; he leaves no clear impression of what are the sins which are threatening the

life of the community. He seems as though he would be satisfied, as though he believed Yahweh would be satisfied, with a day dedicated to prayer and fasting, indeed, as though that in itself was well-pleasing to Him.

Now, that the prophet certainly does not hold the unspiritual conception of Yahweh which would consist with a belief that God values mourning and fasting in themselves is clear from his demand that the people shall rend their hearts and not their garments (ii. 12 f.). Evidently it is not the mourning in itself and for itself, but the humiliation in what it connotes and in the moral change it implies and deepens, which he regards as of any value in the sight of God. Yet the fact remains that he does not show evidence of the pressure of any particular sins on his conscience. And, since the prophet is eminently the conscience of the community in which he lives, that seems to imply a deadened moral tone. A time, when men are not quick to note and ready to signalise the sins of their own age, might seem at the first glance to mark a time when Yahweh is not so clearly conceived as the avenger of injustice and the assertor of right.

That may be true; yet it may be useful to hesitate before passing so sweeping a verdict. For one remembers a particular period during the recent war, when the General Assemblies of the Scottish Churches and perhaps the supreme Courts of other Churches also, called for a day of humiliation and confession before God in the presence of grave national danger. One recalls how vague the terms of the summons were, and especially how indefinite was the statement about our national sins. And one parson at least, then acting chaplain with a Scottish Brigade, is unable to forget how he was asked by several of the men under his charge what were the sins of which we, as a Church and a nation, were required to repent in connexion with that special time, and how difficult it was to give an answer which satisfied himself. It

is comparatively easy to draw up an indictment against Church or nation. It is extraordinarily difficult to say, in connexion with one particular event or at one specified time, what are the specific sins of which any Church ought to repent. And one recalls with interest how vague, and, when they ceased to be vague, how varied in character were the acts of penitence which were made in the several Scottish churches then.

It is one thing to stand over against a community which has forgotten or is deliberately ignoring that the God it worships stands for righteousness. Then Amos must call its sins to remembrance with definite, concrete, patent, overwhelming distinctness, and must set these in all their ugliness in the light of the character of the God whom he loves and fears. He must press home on men's consciences how the things they do and see done are calling for judgment and will bring judgment, unless men repent. But it is a different thing to stand before a community, which has come into existence and continues in existence because of its faith in God and His righteousness, and to ask it for a sincere act of penitence. There are sure to be abundance of sins, calling for judgment and sorely needing repentance. But the sins of a Church, which is humbly trying to constitute itself on the basis of faith in a righteous God, are sure to be more subtle, less open to the light of day, and as varied as the character and work of the men who make up the community. To specify the sins of such a body of men would only lead the men, whose circumstances have shielded them from the specified sins but whose conditions have possibly led them into worse, to a confidence in their innocence which would make their estate more perilous. What seems like laxity of discipline is often growing spirituality: it is the recognition that the sins of the soul are the most dangerous and the most difficult to denounce.

There remains only to the prophet to bid men look to themselves, and rend their hearts and not their garments, one of the spiritual commonplaces which only cease to be commonplace when men try to practise it.

ADAM C. WELCH.

THE OUTLOOK OF THE APOLOGISTS.

THERE is another class of writings, illustrative of second century beliefs, which now demands our attention—that of the Apologists. Of their work, sometimes whole books in version or original, sometimes only small fragments at second hand have been preserved to us. Addressed to quite a different public, the literature of Christian Apologists of diverse types manifests a character alike more intelligent and more intellectual than that exhibited by the writings of the so called Apostolic Fathers, or by the comparatively vulgar compositions of the compilers of early Christian Apocalypses. Whether their works were directed against Jewish opponents or intended to meet the objections of heathen culture and the charges of popular prejudice, the authors with whom we are now dealing stood resolutely on the defensive. And we may assume that they sought, according to the knowledge of their day, and with a corporate and individual religious experience at their disposal, to make the best of their case for Christianity.

The subsidiary part of their argument which we are investigating at the moment is the outlook which their writings reveal in regard to the future destiny of man. In a paper necessarily much abbreviated by reason of limited space it is not possible to include quotations in any fulness; we must therefore confine ourselves to indicating the main characteristics of the beliefs of the Apologists in this respect, however alien they may be from the expectations of edu-

cated Christian people in our own times. If we exclude fragments of doubtful origin, a study of the extant remains from the "apologies" of Aristides of Athens and of his fellow-Greek Athenagoras, of the anonymous writer to Diognetus (although the latter is usually but incorrectly classed with the Apostolic Fathers), of Justin the Martyr and of Irenaeus of Lyons, should be sufficiently representative to afford us adequate data for a general outline of the expectations of the relatively learned among the Christian communities in the second century. We will inquire what may be gathered or inferred concerning the views of such defenders of the Faith in regard to the Coming of the Lord, the preliminary Kingdom and the intermediate state, the Judgment, and what ensues, the fate of men in misery of fiery punishment or in glory of age-long blessedness.

1. The Parousia. The thought of the coming of the Lord tends to recede from its former prominence in Christian anticipation. The Church is settling down for a longer tenure in the world: but the primitive hope is only dimmed by the increasing distance of its objective, and it is not abandoned. It is Justin who designates this event the second advent of Christ at the time when the number of the good is fulfilled (Ap. xlv. 1), as, he held, the ancient prophets announced (lii. 3: Tr. lii.). This would be the glorious coming, with His angel retinue, by contrast with the former one in humility and suffering (Tr. xiv.: xxxi.: xlix. (with Elijah as His precursor): cx.: cxx.). It would involve salvation for the good and faithful, and fiery condemnation for the unrighteous (xxxv.: xlv.). Irenaeus lays stress on the fact that at His second coming Christ will be the Agent of the Resurrection (Her. IV. xxii. 2; cf. I. x. 1), and the bestower of immortality (V. i. 1); but in his belief also it is to be with divine glory (IV. xxvii. 2), as Saviour and Judge (III. iv. 2), in contrast with His human advent (xxxiii. 1). The expression appears too in the epistle to

Diognetus: God will send Jesus as Judge, and who shall endure His coming? (vii. 6); but by Aristides and Athenagoras it is ignored, or at least seems to call for no treatment on their part. Very occasionally is God's advent spoken of rather than Christ's, and that in a general sense: God will be seen by those who possess His Spirit and await His coming (Her. IV. xx. 6).

2. The Millennial Reign. The first century expectation of a temporary, intermediate, or millennial kingdom still persists in our period, and it has been revived again and again until our own days. But it is not so clearly defined as once it was. Justin, with his Syrian upbringing and Ephesian sympathies, is its strongest advocate, and that in controversy with the Jews. He adheres to the anticipation of a thousand years' reign of the risen faithful in the rebuilt, earthly Jerusalem. It is before the general Resurrection and the Judgment that those living worthy of Jesus will reign with Him (Ap. x. 2). The Apologist seeks to base the belief upon testimonies from prophet and psalmist, and supports it from the canonical Apocalypse (Tr. lxxx. f.); but he admits that the expectation in question is by no means universal among Christian people. Indeed, he seems to anticipate that after the Resurrection the Holy Land will once again become the possession of the saints, and Christ will shine as an eternal light in the Holy City (cxiii.). If the impenitent Jews do not inherit anything on the holy mountain (Tr. xxvi.), yet faithful and repentant Gentiles will do so, as spiritual children of Abraham (cxix.). And it is ultimately a universal and everlasting possession which he expects (cxxxix.). Justin is here, as elsewhere, not only familiar with the lines of anti-Judaic polemic, but is in touch with the Rabbinic discussions of his time. Irenaeus follows him in the belief in an earthly kingdom of Jesus, ruling with the righteous in the promised inheritance before

the Judgment (V. xxxii.); and he uses the story of the Last Supper by way of proof, taking the promised drinking of wine literally (xxxiii.), as signifying the banquet of the Messianic Sabbath, and supports from the old prophets (xxxiv. ff.) the expectation of this earthly rule of the saints which John foresaw in the Apocalypse. As we can see, the distinction is not always clearly drawn, and the Palestinian inheritance of the faithful tends to become merged in the eternal Kingdom of God. Before this reign of the saints he places the destruction of Antichrist (xxxii. 1), as also the passing of the Old Creation (xxxvi. 1). Yet the kingdom on the earth constitutes a preparation and discipline for immortality, a period of growth in the vision of God (xxix. 1; xxxi. 1; xxxv. 2). We cannot say that the Church is, in this period, coming to be regarded as an earthly and temporary manifestation of the Kingdom, but it is in a sense the continuing of the Incarnation until the End (IV. xxxiv. 2).

3. The Intermediate Place or State. Before examining the views which were prevalent among these writers as regards the Judgment, there are a few traces of reference to an intermediate state previous to that divine act, sometimes implying a belief in an anticipatory experience of the final fate for those who have passed away.

(*a*) Irenaeus, for instance, has much to say about an intermediate *place* in connexion with his repudiation of Gnostic speculations. With such an intermediate habitation for the souls of the righteous in the realm of Sophia beneath the Pleroma he will have nothing to do, because there is no provision in these heretical faiths for the bodies of men, and therefore it is but an imperfect and partial personality which is preserved, and if all souls pass therein their doctrine would preclude the necessity for judgment (I. v. 1; II. xxix. 1 f. etc.). But he does definitely hold

the opinion that the souls of Christ's disciples pass to the invisible place appointed by God, and there await the Resurrection, to rise in the fulness of personality in the body (V. xxx. 2). So, in another passage, he speaks of souls waiting in Paradise till the Consummation, there preparing for immortality (V. v. 1 ; cf. xxix. 1). In a similar manner, Athenagoras teaches plainly an intermediate duration of soul and body apart from one another (Res. xv.). It is then quite intelligible that the Bishop proves to be strongly opposed to any doctrine whatever of the nature of Transmigration. He takes the Lazarus parable as indicating that form (for recognition) and memory (of conduct) persist, and that classes of souls receive habitations according to their deserts even before the Judgment (II. xxxiv. 1). He dismisses the argument of the followers of Carpocrates that a passing from body to body was essential to the working out of a manifold and complete experience for the soul (I. xxv. 4). Thus he confidently leaves the solution of the moral problem to the Divine being, will, and righteousness, rather than allow himself to indulge in unsafe and fruitless speculation (II. xxiv. 2). But as regards the place of the dead Irenaeus not only utilises inherited (Jewish) beliefs, but argues from the analogy of Christ's sojourn there (II. xxix. 1 ; III. xx. 4 ; IV. xxvii. 4). Aristides, too, may reflect the belief in "another place" for the righteous Christian at death, but it is hardly definite enough for argument (Syr. xv.).

(*b*) We have made allusion just above to the belief of Irenaeus that souls would experience a *foretaste* of their final fate while in an intermediate condition. Athenagoras, on the other hand, expresses the opinion that not only is a just judgment unexperienced by men in this life, but not even so after death during the period of a state of separation (Res. xix.). It was Justin Martyr, however, who probably gave the cue in this, as in many things, to the Bishop of

Lyons, whose teaching was so much influenced by him; for he held that the souls of the godly abide in a better place, and those of the wicked in a worse, as they await respectively the time of judgment (Fr. v.: cf. Tatian, To Greeks, xxxv.).

(*c*) Again, regarding the question of the possibility of spiritual *progress* in this intermediate and temporary condition some hints as to opinions that were entertained are afforded us. Such an expectation seems to be implied in the allusion to preparing for immortality to which reference has already been made (V. v. 1). At the close of the fifth book, however, Irenaeus speaks of the disciplining beforehand for incorruption: of progress in the times of the (preliminary) kingdom: and of vigorous advance towards incorruption (xxix. 1; xxxi. 1; xxxv. 2; xxxvi. 1); but this appears to point, as we have noticed, to the period after the first resurrection of the righteous rather than to the duration in the disembodied state before the Parousia. Nevertheless, the Bishop anticipates such progress in growing communion with God as being continued for the new man in the New Creation, and alludes to a mysterious saying of the Elders concerning degrees of blessedness, symbolised by the figures of heaven, paradise, and the city (xxxvi. 1 f.), representing a gradation of the saved in suitable dwelling places, presumably after the Judgment. A clearly defined system is, therefore, not discoverable, nor anything of the nature of the later doctrine of Purgatory.

4. The Resurrection. It would be well to inquire briefly of these writers what view they maintained as to its nature, condition, reason, range, and agent.

(*a*) Impelled by opposition to the false spiritism or immaterialism of Gnostic doctrines, the Church apologists of the second century were led to lay what is to us a wholly disproportionate stress on the physical, fleshly aspect of

human resurrection, the survival or restoration of the earthly body, and consequently to a false exegesis of the Pauline teaching of a "spiritual" body. There is no gainsaying that, however alien to modern modes of thought, it was a literal, carnal resuscitation which the defenders of the Christian faith taught and intended to teach. Athenagoras, as is well known to students of the period, was the most doughty champion of the crassly physical opinion, and his arguments in its favour are somewhat curious. Justin, moreover, states quite bluntly that folk who think that souls are taken to heaven at death, and who consequently deny a real resurrection of the dead, are not to be regarded as Christians (Tr. lxxx.). He distinguishes, as has been seen, between a preliminary raising of the saints to the millennial reign on earth in Jerusalem and the general and eternal resurrection preceding the Judgment (lxxxi. : ciii.). So in the *Apology* he upholds the common hope, the expectation of believers to receive again their own bodies (xviii.), which, like seeds, arise at God's command (xix. 4) ; but it is only the worthy and righteous who are immortalised (xxi. 6).

Christian realism, however, possesses its most conspicuous exponent in Athenagoras, who vigorously defends the belief in the literal reconstruction of material particles of human bodies. Such a faith was obviously serviceable for rebutting the pagan charge of devouring infants, as if Christians would make themselves tombs for bodies that were to rise again ! (Plea, xxxvi.). In the resurrection change there is, in the belief of this Apologist, a perfect reuniting and an exact re-formation of the physical frame, whether burnt, decayed, or consumed ; and it is God's power that achieves it (Res. xiii.), for such was His purpose for men (xiv.). The body continues, because soul and body, man as such, must endure for ever (xv., xxv), and the intermediate interval is one of separation of the constituent parts of his being (xvi.).

This is supported by analogies from Nature (xvii.). And it is essential that the body should be raised in order that the complete and unified personality may be judged for acts done in this life (xviii., xxi.); for the soul alone cannot fairly sustain the recompense of acts done in the body (xxii.). Thus the crudely materialistic notions of Athenagoras possess an ethical colouring and reflect a teleological doctrine. But it is strange to us that the resurrection of Christ has no place, as far as we know, in his defensive argument. (And only in the Greek version of Aristides (xv.) is the raising of the dead even mentioned.)

The identity of the resurrection body is recognised time and again in the fuller treatment of Irenaeus. It is a raising in the flesh, the salvation of the flesh, which he upholds throughout; and that in relation to heretics and catholics alike (I. xxi. 1; II. xxix. 2; V. ii. 2 f., etc.). And he uses the analogy of the Eucharist, wherein the bread becomes heavenly after the "ekklesis" of God, to corroborate the incorruptibility of the bodies of the faithful, who are fed on the Lord's body and blood (IV. xviii. 5; V. xii. 2). It is surely easier, he argues, to reintegrate decomposed particles than to create originally, when God's power is taken into consideration (V. iii. 2). The Rabbis reasoned in a similar fashion. And, like Athenagoras, he emphasises the salvation of the whole man, the united and full personality (vi. 1). But, unlike him, the Bishop does make use of the resurrection of Christ in the substance of flesh, to urge that it is the same dead flesh that is glorified (vii. 1 f.). And he supports his arguments by the (to us scarcely parallel) resuscitations achieved by our Lord during His ministry (xiii. 1). Indeed, the salvation of the flesh was a purpose of the Incarnation, although the flesh of Jesus was without sin (xiv. 1 f.), and the paternal light will be reflected from His flesh upon ours (IV. xx. 2). Irenaeus also keeps the ethical aspect clear:

because righteous acts are done in bodies, it is the mortal flesh that must be raised and rendered incorruptible (II. xxix. 2). He even uses the quaintly fanciful reason that the reclining of the disciples at the Supper symbolised the imparting of resurrection life to those lying in the earth (IV. xxii. 1).

(*b*) The condition of resurrection worthy of the name, for life and not merely for judgment, is, in the teaching of Irenaeus at any rate, the possession of the Spirit. If we are puzzled how the realism of Christian apologetic in the anti-Gnostic controversy met or set aside the clear statement of St. Paul that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God (1 Cor. xv. 50), we have the answering argument set forth most clearly and with considerable frequency in the Bishop's work. It is the gift of the Holy Spirit which renders a man spiritual and perfect, the Divine Spirit not only completing him, but supplying the saving power (V. vi. 1; ix. 1). Thus he turns the tables on the heretics and accuses them of misinterpretation in taking the Apostle literally. To us the retort is hardly cogent or fair, and the exegesis precarious. The Bishop means that the flesh possessed by the Spirit alone truly lives, that the flesh is really inherited by the Spirit (ix. 3 f.), the "flesh and blood" which is excluded signifying fleshly works (xiii. 1). But a spiritually ordered life establishes the possession of the Spirit, while its absence leaves man mere flesh and blood, without it there being no salvation (ix. 1 ff.). Faith embraces the Spirit, which prepares man in the Son, and He leads to the Father, who grants incorruption unto life (IV. xx. 4 f.; cf. Apost. Preaching, vii.). The vision of God, the true life of man, is for such as bear His Spirit and await His coming (6 f.). Even the "bread of immortality" is equated with "the Spirit of the Father" (xxxviii.; cf. Ap. Pr. xlvii.), which in the Incarnation constituted the link betwixt

God and man (V. i. 1). As bodies are said to rise through the Spirit (V. vii. 2, etc.), the urgency of preserving the Divine power by a rightly ordered life supplies a potent ethical lever (ix. 3), for it is by Christian practice that the seal of eternal life, given in Baptism, becomes effective (Ap. Pr. iii.).

(*c*) As to the reason for resurrection, the most striking theory is that of Athenagoras. While the general trend of opinion, Jewish and Christian, was that the raising of men was primarily that they might receive the Divine sentence, he stood out against this by attributing the act directly to God's final purpose for humanity—man was created, soul and body, for immortality. For not all are judged—infants, for example—but all human beings rise again (Res. xiv.). That is the end for man, as a rational being, in contrast with the brutes (xv., xxiv. f.).

(*d*) As to the range, it may well be gathered from the brief summaries so far offered that the Resurrection is an act of God, directly or indirectly, and is of universal application. That was the general belief. Where the temporary kingdom of Christ is still a prominent feature, the first raising only affects the saints (Just., Iren.); but the final or general resurrection embraces all (Athen., Just., Iren.); yet only the bodies of the worthy will be immortalised (Just. Ap. I. xxi. 6).

(*e*) The Agent of the Resurrection is represented as being either God or the Word. (i.) Sometimes the Father is spoken of as the Agent. In Justin, God will raise all men and appoint the issues of judgment (Tr. cxvii.). Likewise for Irenaeus, it is the power of God that accounts for the raising of the flesh, although the heretics do not appreciate it (V. iii. 2), and he illustrates it by O.T. examples (v. 1 f.); God's power quickened Christ's flesh and quickens ours, and that through the Spirit (vii. 1). In the last resort it is He who, as Christians maintain, resuscitates the mortal bodies

of the righteous (II. xxix. 2). (ii.) More often the act of raising is ascribed to the Son or the Word. This is especially so with the Bishop of Lyons. When He returns in the Father's glory, the only-begotten Word will raise all flesh (III. xvi. 6); as Word He spoke to Moses, as Word He bestows the gift of resurrection (IV. v. 2); first He raises the righteous, then the rest (xxii. 2). Bodily resurrection, like immortality, is often emphasised as a boon from the Word (V. i. 1; ii. 3), and yet it is God's free gift. And the act applies universally, all flesh of all mankind (I. x. 1). In his interpretation of the Lazarus parable, Moses and the prophets are regarded as having preached the Son, risen and life-giver for those who believe in Him (IV. ii. 4, 7). And in connexion with his doctrine of the Eucharist, it is the Word who grants the bodies of Christians resurrection at the proper time (V. xii. 2).

5. The Judgment. In common opinion the main purpose of the raising of men was that they might receive the due judgment of God, their conduct in this life affording the moral basis of decision. As in the previous section, here also there is a diversity of statement exhibited as to the Agent. Sometimes it is God, more often the glorified Jesus, who is the Judge. (i.) To Athenagoras, judgment, like resurrection, belongs to the working out of the final purpose of the Creator (Res. xiv.), and it is a perfectly moral verdict upon the whole man (xviii., xx. ff.). Even Justin occasionally ascribes judgment to the Almighty (Tr. xcvi.). For Irenaeus, when refuting the tenets of Marcion, the wise judgment of the Father exceeds all human and angelic wisdom, because He is Lord and Judge, and it is wholly ethical, for His goodness has precedence of His justice (III. xxv. 3). The right judgment of God will ensue on those who have only seen, as well as on those who have believed, the revelation in the Son (IV. vi. 5). The Creator of chaff and wheat

among men is also the Separator (IV. iv. 3), and primarily just judgment is His prerogative (V. xxiv. 2; xxvii. 1). (ii.) According to Justin (Ap. liii. 2), the firstborn of the unbegotten God executes judgment on the whole race of men, as absolute Judge of all (Tr. xlvi., xlix.), living and dead (cxviii.), even to Adam (cxxxii.), and thus is Agent of condemnation (xxxv., xlv.). So at the end of Aristides' apology, men are implored to anticipate the dread judgment to come by Jesus the Messiah upon the whole race of men (Syr. xvii.). In the teaching of Irenaeus, one of the purposes of Christ's return is to administer just judgment to all, when He comes gloriously as Lord, God, and Judge (III. xvi. 6; xix. 3). In many other passages the Bishop alludes to the final judicial functions of the Son or Word (III. iv. 2), and that upon all, seen and known of all (v. 3; ix. 1), being Judge of living and dead, as the Apostles preached (xii. 7, 13). That is part of the totality of sovereignty committed to Him by the Father (IV. xx. 2); and, as one of the tests is belief in Himself, the judgment is in a sense already accomplished (in the Johannine manner) on the faithless and transgressors (xxviii. 1 f.); yet His sentence is eternal in its issues (3), and His judgeship even prophets and psalmists foresaw, and His verdict is inescapable (xxxiii. 11, 16). Thus the Word has full authority delegated from the Father, and His advent is to all to judge and to separate, while all have freewill that they may believe, so that the loss for sinners is self-chosen and eternal (V. xviii. 3; xxvii. 1 f.). From what has been adduced the inference can be drawn that the Judgment, too, was expected to be universal; save for such as infants, who, in the opinion of Athenagoras, would not undergo judgment, being still, as we should say, non-moral. Aristides, Justin and Irenaeus, as we can see, lay the stress on the absoluteness and universality of Christ's judgment (or God's), rather than con-

:ider exceptions to the rule. The Pauline doctrine concerning the saints as assessors in judgment finds an echo in Irenaeus, who assumes that the spiritual Christian will judge heretics and also those without (IV. xxxiii. 2 ff.).

6. The Issues. When we examine the views maintained as to the destinies of men subsequent to the Judgment, we do not find gruesome materialistic detail relative to the woes of the condemned. There are no pictorial descriptions of bliss or torment such as engaged our attention when studying the Christian apocalypses of approximately the same period. (i.) In the case of the ungodly, the treatment is very broad. Fire is the commonest figure for and the chief feature of Punishment; but the latter is regarded mainly as eternal, although some passages suggest annihilation. The writer to Diognetus says grimly that the philosophers will go to the fire which they say God is (viii. 2), and punishment is final and fiery for the condemned, being the reward of sin (ix. 2; x. 7). To fire Christ will send the unrighteous, conscious eternally, according to Justin (Ap. lii. 3), and Christians pray that pagans and persecutors may not be doomed to it, if only they repent and believe (xxxv.). Irenaeus holds that eternal fire is prepared by God for every sort of apostasy (V. xxvi. 2; cf. II. xxviii. 7). The primitive dualism is still strong: Satan, the demons' ruler, will be sent into the fire for endless punishment, as Jesus declared (Just. Ap. xxviii. 1); for him and his associates it was originally prepared (Iren. III. xxiii. 3). The Jewish term Gehenna is sometimes used for the place of punishment for unbelievers and for Antichrist. To Justin, the punishment will be in body and soul eternally, and not only for a thousand years, as Plato taught (Ap. viii. 4); it is eternal retribution by or in fire for conscious souls (xiii. 2; xviii. 2 f., etc.). Therein men remain immortal, a spectacle to all flesh, reminding us of apocalyptic belief (Tr. cxxx.). In Irenaeus, heretics

will pass to the destruction of fire (II. xxxii. 2), which comes at the End (IV. xx. 11), and with it is associated, as in the Gospel, darkness, itself also eternal and prepared (IV. xxxix. 4). Athenagoras has shown that punishment must be for the complete humanity, according to the deserts of each (Res. xviii., xx. ff., xxv.); so likewise with reward. Similarly Justin teaches that punishment or salvation is in accord with the value of acts (Ap. xii.), and the note of consciousness is influenced by the close of Isaiah (lii. 7). Irenaeus seems to hint at degrees of woe, when he mentions increased punishment for rejecters of the opportunity of believing the Word (IV. xxviii. 1 f.). Perhaps also Aristides implies that the dead in sins go into punishment (Syr. xv.). The metaphors of penalty (Just.), ruin, and retribution (Iren.) are also occasionally used. Here and there are hints of a tendency to believe in final annihilation. The subject belongs rather to a treatment of the psychology of these Fathers, but a word may be said. With Justin, those worthy of God never die, but others are punished as long as He wills them to exist (Tr. v.; cf. Ap. xx.; II. vii.; Theoph. To Autol. ii. 27); yet he also declares sinners to remain immortal (Tr. cxxx.). Irenaeus seems to betray a like inconsistency, predicating eternal continuance for the saved in contrast with wilful rejecters; then he appears immediately to contradict himself by withdrawing from the implied assertion of annihilation (II. xxxiv. 3), like as he states later that the substance of the old creation is not annihilated (V. xxxvi. 1).

(ii.) We turn now to the brighter sequel, the lustre of the life of the redeemed, in the eternal kingdom or world which was envisaged beyond the Judgment. (*a*) The Kingdom idea falls comparatively into the background, and stress is laid on the nature of its life, the incorruptibility and immortality of the saints, and its glorious guerdon of the vision

of God. The godly are destined for the eternal Kingdom of God or of Christ. (1) With the writer to Diognetus, it is God's Kingdom that is promised and given (ix. 1 ; x. 2). In Justin, the inheritance of the Holy Land is for endless eternity (Tr. cxix.), and the good and the Kingdom are alike everlasting (cxxxix. f.). So in Irenaeus, if "the times of the kingdom," the rest or Sabbath (V. xxx. 4), seem confined to the preliminary reign on earth (cf. xxviii. 3 ; xxxiv.), the contrast with the lake of fire suggests a wider significance. For the Bishop, with the loss of the Spirit comes deprivation of the Kingdom of God, but the faithful enjoy therein fellowship with the angels (ix. 3 ; xxxv. 1). Through the Spirit mortal members are translated into it (4), but without the former it cannot be possessed (xi. 1). As in the Gospel, the Kingdom is prepared for the righteous (IV. xl. 1 f.). But (2) it is termed also Christ's Kingdom. Justin discusses the salvation of Jews who believe Him to be the Judge, and that His is the everlasting Kingdom (Tr. xlvi.) ; but the Gentiles who believe will reign with Him incorruptibly (Ap. x. 2), and His Kingdom is from the tree (xli. 1). With Irenaeus, to a place in Christ's Kingdom the righteous are raised at the Parousia (IV. xxii. 2), an eternal one then introduced (V. xxvi. 2), to which the earthly reign before noticed is but preliminary (xxxii. 1). To Aristides also the coming age is synonymous with the Kingdom for the saved (Syr. xv. f.).

(*b*) Life, however, the chief characteristic, boon, or quality of the Kingdom, is the term more commonly used to designate the state of the blessed, and its deathless nature is often brought into prominence by the notes of incorruption and immortality. The richer content given to Life by the emphasis on these aspects is due especially to Irenaeus, and they emerge so frequently that a catena of references is precluded by lack of space. Noteworthy emphasis falls on the fact that Life is a Divine gift, yet

gained or lost according to man's faith and conduct. It is a boon of the grace of God (II. xxxiv. 3), characteristic of the coming age (III. vii. 2), bestowed by the risen Lord (IV. ii. 4), while perdition is the cutting off from it (xi. 4). Those who see God obtain life, for it comes from fellowship with Him and from revelation through the Word (IV. xx. 5 ff.). It is conferred on men's bodies (V. iv. 1), but found or lost according to the reception of the Spirit (xii. 2 f.). Frequently the attribute æonian, eternal, is added. Bodies possess the hope of rising to eternal life (IV. xvii. 5), and flesh shares unending life from God (V. iii. 2), who confers eternal duration on the dead (v. 2), and, becoming spiritual, they possess perpetual life (vii. 1). Believers on the Crucified receive everlasting life, which the Jews who slew Him lack (IV. xxviii. 3). The saved are granted length of days for ever (II. xxxiv. 3), the reward of the faithful (IV. xv. 2), which unbelievers lose (III. xix. 1), and the water of life may be drawn from the Church (iv. 1). Even on Abraham the Word bestows eternal life (IV. xiii. 4) for it is the gift of incorruption (xx. 5). Occasional allusion is made by Justin to immortality and incorruptible good (Ap. xix. 4; xlii. 4; Tr. cxxxix.); and perhaps Aristides speaks of indestructible life (Syr. xvii.); but it is chiefly in the work of Irenæus that incorruption and immortality, whether named together or singly, are treated as either (1) a future boon, like the Kingdom and Life, or else (2) a return or reward for faith and the righteous conduct associated therewith as its outcome. The two conceptions are often closely combined. References abound in the Bishop's writings, but we must forbear to include even a selection from them here. It should, however, be remarked how intimately he relates this glorious and eternal inheritance of the saints with the Incarnation (and Passion) of the Word. And the blissful, joyful and glorious Vision of God is, to the mystical mind

of the Bishop of Lyons, inseparable from life and immortality. On this consummation for believing humanity he frequently lays stress. To some of the passages in question incidental allusion has been made above.

The student of the Apologists will find interesting if inconsistent material illustrative of their psychological doctrine, and a general consensus on the subject of the freedom of the human will. But these writers afford no hope of a change of lot by virtue of any repentance after death or judgment. And their teaching regarding the New World proves rather to be one of renovation than of literal recreation after total destruction, the making of an adapted environment for incorruptible humanity. To these subsidiary topics we can do no more here than make allusion.

EDWARD WILLIAM WINSTANLEY.

RIVERS OF LIVING WATER.

As soon as we have satisfied ourselves that there was a collection of *Testimonies* (or Quotations) *against the Jews* in existence, prior to the composition of the earliest books of the New Testament, we cannot escape from the duty and delight of trying to estimate the extent to which this popular Bible Text Book has coloured and influenced the writings that come after it. We read our New Testament with fresh zest and with constantly increasing illumination. Even the mere fact of going over the text, and marking the passages, which, on account of their anti-Judaic character, may be suspected of having been in the Primitive *Testimony Book*, or which, on account of their actual existence in early forms of the traditional *Testimonies against the Jews*, may safely be identified as belonging to the primitive deposit, leads us to many fresh conclusions with regard to the first

authors of the New Testament. For example, when we have marked off all the anti-Judaic quotations in the Pauline Epistles (say, in Romans, for an example), we find that there is surprisingly little left for St. Paul's own personal and direct use of the Old Testament. We say that this is a surprising result, as we have always been in the habit of regarding him as a great Rabbi, with all of the ancient Scriptures at his finger-tips. It may be doubted whether this is correct. If he was a bibliolater, it was in the second degree, and at one remove. He used the popular quotations in the handbook of the primitive Church, just as humbler believers did, expanding them as was expedient from his own knowledge, but not necessarily going far afield from the area which they covered; and this area is by no means equivalent to the complete surface of the Old Testament: it is a series of enclosures from the great Common Lands of Scripture.

If such a result should be suggested for the writings of so good a student as St. Paul, it will be proper to enquire how far similar results are probable for other Biblical writers, say for the four Evangelists. And the enquiry will be particularly interesting in the case of the Fourth Gospel, where it has long been recognised that the author was definitely hostile to the Jews, and where the central Figure is made to coincide with the same line of thought. Thus two problems at once emerge: we have to ask how much the anti-Judaic writer of the Fourth Gospel (I will call him John) has utilised the anti-Judaic text-book which was certainly accessible to him; and how far he has made Jesus use the same language, and whether Jesus as so represented is painted with correct historical colouring.

In the first case we have to begin by marking the genuine anti-Judaica of the Fourth Gospel, both the submerged allusions, such as underlie the Prologue, and the definite citations, which we can trace in the tradition of the *Testi-*

mony Books. We shall thus be led on to determine, in the next place, whether any of such *Testimonies*, submerged or apparent, affect the teaching of the Lord, or whether they are limited to His Apostolic Notary. The subject is a wide one, too wide for the compass of a single article; we will proceed by the method of illustrative passages, and then show, by a particular instance, how to apply our results to the definite elucidation of the Gospel.

For example, it will not be difficult to show (the forthcoming volume of our second book of *Testimonies* will have something to say on the matter) that the twelfth chapter of John has a nest of anti-Judaic *Testimonies* in verses 38–52. They are editorial and are meant to show that the friction between Jesus and the Jews was predestined and foretold; there is the opening verse of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, the word of Isaiah (*ὁ λόγος Ἡσαΐου*), which has to be fulfilled, about proclamations that meet with no response ("Who hath believed our report?"). The student of *Testimonies* recognises at once that the quotation about the "word of Isaiah" was originally introduced by *Ἡσαΐας λέγει*, in the book of extracts from which it is taken; and he turns at once to Romans x. 16, where he finds the earlier form, "Isaiah says"; it is the usual formula of the text-books. He finds that in this chapter Paul is altogether dependent on the book of *Testimonies*, and that Justin takes citations from the very same source. We are on Testimony ground; it is not merely that the writers agree in a quotation: their contexts show that there was a previous group of quotations, from which they are borrowing.

Then we turn back to John, and find him quoting another anti-Judaic passage from Isaiah (this time with the formula "Isaiah said") about the blinding of Jews' eyes and the hardening of Jews' hearts and the difficulty (if not the impossibility) of converting them; and here again we are

certain that it is anti-Judaic matter, not only from its context in Isaiah c. vi. ("Go ye to this people and say," etc.), but because it is used anti-Judaically by St. Paul in the last chapter of the Acts ("The Holy Spirit spake by the prophet Isaiah to your fathers, Go to this people," etc.), and because it is in the tradition of Mark and of Matthew in the same sense: see Matthew xiii. 14, 15, and Mark iv. 12. So here again we have an undoubted primitive testimony, and this time it goes back to the lips of Christ Himself. The Jesus of the Synoptics is anti-Judaic, as well as the Christ of the Fourth Gospel. So much by way of preliminary to illustrate the statement that there is anti-Judaic matter in the Fourth Gospel, and that it is not altogether original.

Now let us turn to another point. We are beginning to see that these lost quotations are the Dominical Oracles of Papias, and that every one translated them (who needed a translation) at his own sweet will. The possibility of Aramaic elements in the New Testament therefore includes within itself a subordinate possibility, viz., the existence of elements of translation from an Aramaic *Book of Testimonies*. We are all of us on the *qui vive* at the present day to find Aramaic origin for parts of the New Testament, say for passages in Mark, or, with greater speculative licence, for certain portions of the Acts: those who have been on the look-out longest are found to be most cautious in accepting Aramaic explanations of various readings and similar phenomena, because they know from experience how easily such work in a Semitic language deceives both the eye and the ear, and leads to wrong conclusions as to similarity of shapes and letters and sounds of words: but this natural reserve of judgement does not arise from any prejudice against such explanations in themselves: if Aramaic originals exist at all, it may be taken for granted that the

translation of such originals will sometimes betray itself by errors of its own.

We proceed to apply these remarks to the study of a single passage in the Fourth Gospel, itself one of the most obscure in the whole of the book, both as regards its origin and its interpretation. We come to the study of it with the single assumption that St. John uses the *Testimony Book*, and that the *Testimony Book* was written, as Papias says, in Hebrew, i.e. in Aramaic. The passage to which we refer is John vii. 37, 38:

> "Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scriptures said, Rivers of living water shall flow out of his belly."

The perplexity of the interpreters of this passage may be estimated from the margins of the modern Greek Testament: for example, Nestle directs us to Isaiah xliv. 3; lv. 1; lviii. 11; Ezekiel xlvii. 1, 12; Zechariah xiii. 1; xiv. 8; Joel ii. 28; iii. 18.

It is an instructive exercise to examine why these passages are quoted, for Nestle is never artificial, and generally singularly apposite, in his quotations: but I suppose the average reader would still say, at the end of his examination of the nine passages, "Where did the Scriptures say that?" Would it not have been better to put a big note of interrogation on the margin? Then we have the further difficulty in the quotation of a passage so grotesque, that we are almost obliged to slur it over in reading; and this grotesque passage is put into the mouth of Christ Himself.

In one respect the interpretation can be made easier. It has been known for many years that the Old Latin and Western texts (the Codex Bezæ, for instance)[1] suggested a

[1] In the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, we find the martyr Sanctus described as being bedewed by the heavenly fountain of the water of life which proceeds ἐκ τῆς νηδύος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Here again we have

different division of the verses, according to which we were to read:

"Let him come to me and drink, that believeth on me." As the Scripture said, etc.

According to this method of division, the grotesque quotation is now transferred to the Evangelist, but it does not cease to be grotesque.

If, however, we are really dealing with Testimony matter, we are permitted to suggest that the text in question comes by translation from Aramaic. Now in the Syriac language the word for "belly" is "karsa"; but there is another word "karsya," only differing from it consonantally by the insertion of the smallest letter in the alphabet, which means "throne." (The primitive Aramaic and Syriac texts had no vowels.)

Replace the one word by the other, and the Scripture says,

"Out of his throne shall flow rivers of living water."

As soon as we have made the correction we see at once that we are on the right track, for we remember that the last chapter of the New Testament begins with the words:

"He shewed me *a river of living water*, gleaming like crystal, *proceeding out of the throne* of God and the Lamb";

and that the very same chapter towards the close makes Jesus say:

"He that is athirst let him come, and let the one that wills take the water of life freely."

Here the "one that wills" (ὁ θέλων) corresponds closely with "the one that believes" (ὁ πιστεύων), and we see that the Old Latin division of the text is the right one. The passages in John vii. and the verses in Apoc. xxii. must be taken together. With the aid of a Syriac *yud*, and the parallel verse of the Apocalypse, the grotesqueness of the

the Western division of the text assumed, and a combination of John vii. 38 with Apoc. xxi. 6.

evangelical passage has disappeared. For ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ we are now to restore ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ. The old text and the old translation may be abandoned.

Perhaps the reader, although in a measure satisfied and relieved, is still saying, "What was the Scripture?": so we add a few words on that point.

It was probably in the first instance a composite quotation, such as often occurs in primitive *Testimonies*, perhaps in its simplest form a junction of the two statements that

"Living water shall go out of Jerusalem" (Zech. xiv. 3);

and that

"They shall call Jerusalem the Lord's Throne" (Jer. iii. 17);

the combination appearing as

"Living water shall go forth from the throne of the Lord."

Some such combination may have been the origin of the obscure passage in John which we have been discussing. It is not so easy to decide the place in which the sentences occurred in the *Book of Testimonies*. The closest parallel is the constant reference in such collections to the passage in Isaiah ii. 3, "Out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem," which is commonly interpreted to mean the New Law of the Christians; but this can hardly be the section under which the Johannine extract stood. We leave the perplexity unresolved.

Rendel Harris.

ECCLESIASTES XII. 6.

The great difficulty every expositor of this verse has to face, in teaching or preaching, can be seen from the various endeavours made by the commentators who tackled it from the oldest times up to more recent days. Generally they could not get further than the Targum or the Midrash.[1] It matters very little indeed whether the "silver cord" means "tongue," "soul" or "spinal column," and the "golden bowl" is applied to the "head" or the "brain." The chief difficulty remains. Does verse 6 really contain a picture of the approximation of death? In that case the writer returns to a subject he settled already in the previous verse. If the man is gone already to his eternal house, and the mourners go around the street, well then, neither the tongue nor the brain are working any more. Surely the writer had something else in his mind! We venture to offer a new exposition.

The verse is a picture of the ceremonies and rituals usual after death and at burial. It expresses the imagery of these rites in four different parts which require detailed comment.

The first part עד לא ירתק חבל הכסף must have caused considerable anxiety to the ancient translators and commentators. Ketib has ירחק, be put far away; Keri ירתק, close up, bind, G.S.V. צ. ינתק, severed. Which is the right reading? That depends on the interpretation of the silver cord. We know from Rabbinic sources that the Jews were accustomed

[1] v.f.i. The Pulpit Commentary *ad loc. Graetz, Koheleth*, p. 139, says: The similes used in this verse are even more unintelligible than those in the previous sentence. In order to reach a somewhat more satisfactory solution of the difficulties, one has to give up all the traditional interpretations. Adolf Gerson in his *Der Chacham Kohelet als Philosoph und Politiker*, Frankfurt a. M., p. 46, admits that he could find no satisfactory exposition for this passage.

to bind a coin or place a metal on the corpse of the deceased, just as the Greeks, of whom we have detailed reports on the Charon money (*v.* E. Rohde, *Psyche*, Tübingen, I[5]. p. 25, 214, and 306 7 Note). The Babylonian teacher Raba relates in the name of the women of שכנציב,[1] who used to lament at the death of people: שיול אצטלא דמלתא לבר חורין דשליכו זוזדיה (b. Moed Katan 28 B): Borrow a garment of linen, in order to provide the necessities for a free man's journey.[2] Further, רהיט ונפל יל כיעברא ויזופתא יזוף, i.e. "he ran, and fell, and on the passage he has to borrow the money for the crossing."[3] That means nothing else but the duty of the friends or relatives of the deceased to provide for the expenses of his journey. This is the source of the still prevailing custom among the Jews to place a coin under the tongue of the departed (*v.* Jacob Reifmann, פשר דבר, p. 15). In the time of the Mishna it was customary to place some metal on the navel (Sabb. 151B, Semahoth I. 2), where a rational explanation is given, i.e., in order to delay the putrefaction of the body (*v.* on this S. Krauss, *Talmudische Archæologie*, II. p. 55, and note 412 on p. 474). However that may be, we see that metal was used in these funeral rites, either for binding it on the navel or placing it under the tongue or on the body. We may go even a step further, and find in the word הבל an allusion

[1] As to שכנציב, *v. Berliner, Beitrage zur Geographie und Ethnographie Babyloniens im Talmud und Midrasch*, Berlin, 1883, pp. 64–65.

[2] There are two different comments on this sentence, none of which seems, however, satisfactory. Death is like a garment of linen to a noble man, who lost his fortune (R. Hananel I, and Rashi). He who has no garment to wear, let him borrow a garment of linen from his neighbours, in order to be able to attend the funeral of a noble man (R. Hananel II). The only possible translation seems to be: Borrow, or lend, a garment of linen, in order to supply a free man, i.e. the departed, with the necessary money or property for his long journey.

[3] R. Hananel read: רהיט ונפיל בר אודי ואמברי יזופתא יזוף, i.e., he ran (he worked hard all his life), and fell (perished among those who lost their fortune, r. ביני אובדי), and on the crossing (i.e before the gate of death), he has to borrow the Charon farthing.

to the meaning of the rite.[1] Life was perhaps regarded by Ecclesiastes, just as by the teachers of the Tannaitic period, e.g. Eleazar ben Arach or R. Meir's wife, Beruriah, as a deposit which has to be returned.[2] Ecclesiastes meant to say: Man goes to his eternal home, i.e. they prepare for his funeral, mourners go already around the street, *whilst the life money is not yet bound to the corpse*, which was done perhaps just before the body left the house.

The second part, ותרץ גלת הזהב, describes a ceremony, which was performed also before leaving the house or at the grave. From a Borajta we may infer that the mourners were throwing vessels into the graves (b. Sanh. 48a), or according to some interpretations on the coffin.[3] It was done, so we are told, in order to give expression to the deeply felt grief. Yet we have reason to assume that the Jewish funeral rite agreed in this instance also with the belief of other nations that it was given either to appease the spirit of the departed, or to supply him with the most necessary or precious things for the time of resurrection (*v.* Rohde, *Psyche*, l.c. p. 127 f.). Thus did they bury with a king his sword, crown and seal (j. AZ. 42c). The throwing of these things is verified by many passages (*v.* Krauss, l.c. p. 475, note 421). One cannot throw these things without breaking them. Ecclesiastes might have had in mind the burial of a ruler or king, and, without doubt, by throwing the golden crown, it was broken. He meant therefore: People are gathered for the burial, before the golden crown to be cast on the coffin or in the grave, is broken.

Another rite is preserved in the third part of our verse,

[1] The women of שכנציב also used to say: ויי לאזלא ויי לחבולא, woe unto him, who departed; woe unto him, who has to refund the deposit.

[2] *v.* Aboth of R. Nathan 14. 6; and Midrash Proverbs 31. 10, *v.* also R. Meir in Eccl. r. 5, 10. Seder Elijahu Rabba ch. 18. The idea was known to Epictet. and Seneca, *v. J. Bergmann*, in H. Cohen's *Judaica*, p. 154.

[3] *v.* Brüll, *Jahrbücher* I., p. 15.

which was noticed by the author of a history of the Jews in Babylon, by Nahum n Zebi Gezow (יגל נהרות בבל, Warsaw, 1887, p. 72, note 15). He refers namely to b. Ket. 28 B, where the question is raised: What is קצצה? If one of the brethren married a member of a family which is regarded as inferior, then the members of the superior family come, and bring a barrel full of fruits, and break it in the midst of the street, and say: "Our brethren, house of Israel! hear, our brother X married a woman from an inferior family, and we are afraid lest our seed might mingle with his seed, come and take an example for yourself for all generations, lest his seed should mix with our seed!" (*v.* also Krauss, T.A. II. 454, note 283). Gezow ought to have noticed that the custom prevailed likewise in a case when somebody sold his fields in Palestine to a stranger. R. Jose b. Abin relates: "Whosoever sells his field to a stranger, his relatives bring barrels full of nuts and almonds, and break them before the children and the latter gather them, and say: X is cut off from his property!" (Ruth r. 7. 10). We find further the custom of casting nuts and almonds before bride and bridegroom in a Borajta (b. Berachot 50B, v. Büchler, *Das Ausgiessen von Wein und Öl als Ehrung bei den Juden.* MGW 7. 1905 (49) p. 13). This rite showed that bride and bridegroom are separated from the household they belonged to previously. It is a recognised fact that wedding and death ceremonies originate in similar conceptions. Is it unreasonable to assume that the *breaking* of the pitcher or water jar at the spring was a sign of the severed connexion between the departed and those whom he left behind? According to this interpretation, the verse speaks of three different rites, applied immediately before the funeral. Having done them, the wheel descends into the pit, i.e. the burial takes place. "Wheel" is often identified with human life. Life and wheel are

synonymous in the Agadah, just as in poetry and literature of other nations (*v. Weinhold, Glücksrad und Lebensrad*, Berlin Academy, 1892; and Legge, *Rivals and Forerunners*, I. p. 135: I have flown out of the sorrowful weary wheel). A few instances from the Agadah may suffice here. In the school of R. Ishmael it was taught: Life, or fortune is a wheel which turns around the world (b. Sabb. 151B). The world is like a wheel (Exod. r. 31. 14; Lev. r. 34, 3; Ruth r. 2, 19). The custom to place a dish of lentils or eggs before the mourners is explained symbolically by the same idea. Just as the lentils or eggs are round, likewise is death, loss of life, mourning a thing which turns round like a wheel among human beings (b. Baba Bathra 16B, v. Jerome, Ep. XXII. ad Paulam, Pirke of R. Ehezer, ch. 25 and 38; Ps. Jon. Targum Gen. 25. 29; Gen. r. 63. 16, 63, 19; p. Ber. 3.1; v. Bacher, *Hagoren*, I. p. 64; Brüll, *Jeshurun*, VIII. 33; Krauss, J. Q. R. VI. 227; Ehrentreu, *Jahrbücher der jüd. literar. Gesellschaft*, X. (1913) p. 218 f.).

According to our suggestions Ecclesiastes xii. 5b–7 are to be arranged and translated:

1. For the man goes to his eternal house,
2. And the mourners go around the street.
1. While the silver cord is not *yet tied*,
2. Nor the golden bowl broken,
3. Nor the water-jar be shattered at the well.
1. And the wheel shall be broken at the grave,
2. And the dust shall return to the earth as it was,
3. And the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.

A. Marmorstein.

THE POINT OF STRAIN IN CHRISTIAN ETHIC.

Anyone who has been watching the trend of thought, and still more the mode of life, in our time, must have been conscious of a certain shifting in the line of attack upon Christianity. Christian people have long been acclimatised to assaults upon the Christian theology. The Bible and its inspiration have passed through their baptism of fire, and we are able now to see what is, and what is not, worth defending in that region. The doctrines of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, of the Atonement, with other elements in the Christian scheme of thought, have all been in the position of besieged cities, and, with their ramparts in part rebuilt to meet emergencies, have survived the worst of their ordeal. But it became evident that the attack would not halt at the Christian theology: the turn of the Christian ethic would come. And it has come.

For the sake of convenience and brevity, this article is concerned not with the Christian ethic as a whole but only with a part of that ethic under fire. But it is a typical and a representative part—the part that is often taken as a summary of the whole. For a very long time, the Golden Rule was accepted as the pocket *vade mecum* of Christianity by many who did not wish to burden themselves with the more cumbrous impedimenta of theology. It was blandly accepted by many mild and harmless persons, members of Ethical Societies and others, who were thus able to discard the robes of dogma while retaining a thin fragment of orthodoxy to veil their spiritual nakedness.

Do unto others as you would have others do to you! What could be simpler than this? What more beyond the reach of attack or impeachment? What more reasonable law of life—if not rigid enough to satisfy the bigots

of ecclesiastical courts, at least sufficient to regulate the amenities of life in Garden Suburbs? Here, if anywhere, surely lies the centre of that "sweet reasonableness" which Matthew Arnold proclaimed in the teaching of Christ,—a sure stronghold therefore for the souls of men after all the irrationalities of dogma are laid low. One hates to break in upon this happy assumption with disturbing news, but the spear-points of scepticism have long been heading in this direction: and many excellent persons are haunted by the fear that the Golden Rule is not as firm a fortress as they had at one time imagined it to be. People have been gradually waking up to the fact that the Golden Rule, instead of being easy, is difficult, difficult to understand and difficult to apply. Worse still, they have begun to suspect that it may even be a dangerous and unhealthy counsel. That is why it is here named the *point of strain* in Christian ethic: many are asking whether that ethic is not failing altogether because it fails here.

This newer scepticism is not, of course, altogether new, though it is new in the sense that it is now becoming part of the conscious perplexity of the average man. A few instances may be taken from literature of different times and types.

A quotation from that arch-cynical person, Thomas Hobbes, may suffice to start us on our way. He is discussing in *Leviathan*[1] what he calls the Laws of Nature, and he sums them up in the Golden Rule, which he states in its negative form, "Do not that to another, which thou wouldest not have done to thyself." And he proceeds: "The Lawes of Nature oblige *in foro interno*: that is to say, they bind to a desire they should take place: but *in foro externo*,—that is, in the putting of them in act, not alwayes. For he that should be modest, and tractable and

[1] Chap. xv (*Everyman's Edition*, p. 82).

performe all he promises, in such time, and place, where no man els should do so, should but make himselfe a prey to others, and procure his own certain ruine." It is scarcely an exaggeration of Hobbes' doctrine in this and other passages to translate it in this fashion—that it is possible to carry out the Christian law in a Christian world: in a non-Christian world, it is not possible. It is a leap of two and a half centuries to Bernard Shaw and the *Revolutionist's Handbook*, but it is not a long step in logic from Hobbes' position to this, the first of the "Maxims for Revolutionists"—"Do not unto others as you would that they should do unto you. Their tastes may not be the same," or this, the third of the same sequence: "Do not love your neighbour as yourself. If you are on good terms with yourself, it is an impertinence; if on bad, an injury." To take another example from thinking still comparatively recent, perhaps no more corrosive acid has ever been poured on the Christian law of love, as commonly understood, than that which is so quietly and yet so effectively employed by Herbert Spencer in *The Study of Sociology*.[1]

"Were A to be careless of himself, and to care only for the welfare of B, C and D, while each of these, paying no attention to his own needs, busied himself in supplying the needs of the others;—this round-about process, besides being troublesome, would very ill meet the requirements of each, unless each could have his neighbour's consciousness. After observing this, we must infer that a certain predominance of egoism over altruism is beneficial; and that in fact no other arrangement would answer. Do but ask what would happen if, of A, B, C, D, etc., each declined to have a gratification in his anxiety that some one else should have it, and that the some one else similarly persisted in refusing it out of sympathy with his fellows—do but contemplate the resulting confusion and cross-purposes and loss of gratification to all, and you will see that pure altruism would bring things to a deadlock just as much as pure egoism. In truth, nobody ever dreams of acting out the altruistic theory in all the relations of life. The Quaker who proposes to accept literally, and to practise, the precepts of Christianity,

[1] P. 179 f.

does business on egoistic principles just as much as his neighbours. Though, nominally, he holds that he is to take no thought for the morrow, his thought for the morrow betrays as distinct an egoism as that of men in general: and he is conscious that to take as much thought for the morrows of others would be ruinous to him and eventually mischievous to them."

It would be easy to pick further examples of this corrosive line of thought, especially from the Nietzschean sphere of influence, which is so infectious and so powerful just because it is so reinforced by the animal in us all: as Benjamin Kidd says in his last book, "It is in Nietzsche's writings that the Western mind first beholds laid bare with unspeakable fidelity that overmastering animal soul . . . which represents the individual efficient in the struggle for his own interests."[1] We shall certainly agree that if the individual's only care is to be efficient in the struggle for his own interests then Nietzsche and not Christ is the prophet of the future.

But we may pass from that to consider an instance which is all the more suggestive because it is a part, not of a criticism, but of a commendation of the Christian law of love; its eagerness for unlimited altruism cannot conceal the pathos of its despair of finding any workable scheme. It is a passage in Leo Tolstoy's Diary[2] describing a man and woman who grow ashamed of living in luxury, hand over their property to others, and settle down in a poverty-stricken village, to earn their living by some handicraft and carry out the Golden Rule in their dealings with their neighbours. They get a hut to live in, clean out the vermin, furnish it sparingly and settle down. At first their neighbours suspect and shun them, then find that something can be got out of them. Demands begin, and, being gratified, increase. Their small comforts disappear. They give away

[1] *The Science of Power*, p. 57.

[2] Translated a few years ago in the *Daily Chronicle*.

their bed to a sick man who has nothing to lie on but a coat full of lice. "Where and how can one stop?" Tolstoy cries :—

"I continue to imagine these people's life. Having worked all day, they return home; having no longer a bed or a pillow, they sleep on some straw they have collected, and after a supper of bread they lie down to sleep. It is autumn. Rain is falling, mingled with snow. Some one knocks at the door. May they refuse to open? A man enters wet and fevered. What must they do? Let him have the dry straw? There is no more dry, so they must either drive away the sick man, or let him, wet as he is, lie on the floor, or give him the straw, and themselves, since one must sleep, share it with him. But even this is not all; a man comes who is a drunkard and a debauchee, whom they have helped several times, and who has always drunk whatever they gave him. He comes now, his jaw trembling, and asks for six shillings, to replace money he has stolen and drunk, for which he will be imprisoned if he does not replace it. They say they have only eight shillings, which they want for a payment due to-morrow. Then the man says, 'Yes, I see, you talk, but when it comes to acts, you're like the rest: you let the man you call a brother perish rather than suffer yourselves. . . .' How is one to act? What is one to do? Not to draw back means to lose one's life, to be eaten by lice, to starve, to die, and—apparently—uselessly. To stop is to repudiate that for the sake of which one has acted, for which one has done whatever good has been accomplished. . . . We must go forward prepared to die. Only *that* love is true love, which knows no limit to sacrifice—even unto death."

As is obvious, the passage is a defence of the most literal and unstinted obedience to the altruistic law; and yet it is a defence of such a kind that it turns in spite of itself into a criticism, into a scepticism; there is heard through it all the hoarse cry of a certain elemental sanity which insists that to this sort of thing there surely ought to be a limit somewhere. In practice we should all find a limit. Yet when we begin to talk about limits, what about the New Testament?

This then, to state it in one form, is the problem we are confronting—*Is the Golden Rule practicable in a world of*

competition? We shall agree with Hobbes that it is possible in a world where everybody else is Christian and acts on Christian principle. It might even be possible, let us say, in a monastery where every man had his own cell, and his own plate of bread and meat, and no private or family ends to gain. But is it a workable counsel in a world organised on a competitive basis, where every one has to earn his daily bread, and the bread of those dependent upon him?

Let us set aside luxury, which is self-condemned, and let us make no defence of swollen profits. Let us confine ourselves for the moment to the shopkeeper or business man who is not in the least greedy or grasping, but simply wants to make a reasonable living wage. Even that modest livelihood may depend in certain matters on his getting up early and getting in before his rival. If he gets in before his neighbour, is he really doing as he would be done by, is he really loving his neighbour as he loves himself? Or the same living wage may depend on his being willing to accept a contract at a smaller profit than his neighbour. If he undercuts that neighbour even in the slightest degree, is he loving that neighbour as he loves himself or doing as he would be done by? Life has to be lived, as Hobbes would point out, not in a Christian world, but in a world filled with people who are more or less in the warlike mood, fighting the battle for existence. We should like to live trustfully, considerately, unselfishly, even in such a world, but if we do live so, we find ourselves taken advantage of at every turn. Is it right to let that go on? If I am to love my neighbour as myself, does that imply that I am to let him walk over me, if he wants to? And if not, where can one draw the line?

In the present economic condition of the country there are perplexities here from which no business man with a conscience can escape. The good man wants to give as well

as to get a living wage; the wage-demand rises and rises until it begins to be doubtful whether business itself is longer possible; the expedient of passing the cost on to the consumer may have its limits after all, though the consumer may be the most patient of beasts of burden. In the Report of the Archbishop's Committee on "The Church and Social Problems" this sentence occurs: "When Christian ethics and economic practice are at variance, the latter must be adapted to the former, not the former to the latter." The Bishop of Hereford, in a lively discussion of the whole Report in the *Edinburgh Review*,[1] describes this as a commonplace of Christian morals, but adds a query as to its application in a concrete instance by no means unlikely to occur.

> "Here is an industry—it is a familiar phenomenon—carried on with difficulty on a narrow margin of profit, a margin so narrow that any considerable increase of working expenses, whether by raising wages, or by shortening hours, will render it totally unremunerative—what is the Christian employer's duty? . . . Does Christianity really require economic suicide?"

It is obvious, then, that the very fact of the economic struggle for existence makes the carrying out of the altruistic law, in anything like a whole hearted manner, a very doubtful possibility.

The problem takes a slightly different shape when looked at from another angle. One side of the Christian law of love is the law of self-denial even to the point of self-crucifixion. And immediately the difficulty arises—for many minds in our own day a most pressing and haunting difficulty—*If I deny myself in any real sense, can I in any real sense develop myself?* And is not self-development a duty which I owe to myself and even to the world? It is not necessary to say much on this point because so much has been said and written upon it. We are once more in the presence of the

[1] January, 1920.

two great opposed ideals of Self-restraint and Self Culture—"Thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece." We stand once more between the two sets of ideas represented by the Apollo and by the Crucifix. Dr. Hugh Black's able book[1] is well known, and he has left little for anyone else to say. Yet it is worth while to point out how close this whole matter is to the practical problem now before us.

Is the Christian law of love practicable in such a world as this? We cannot try with any measure of constancy or sincerity to put it into practice without finding that it contains a Cross, that the cost to ourselves of putting it into practice is great and constant. Yet there is a protest within us which seems to be echoed and reinforced by all things around us. Every rising generation passes through a period when it feels this intensely: the gospel of self-development as opposed to the sterner gospel of self-repression is preached as with a siren's voice by every springtime, every splendour of summer, every flower in the garden or fruit on the tree, every personal power or inherited instinct. Yet every time we open our Bibles, or handle the holy Bread and Wine, or think out the practical implications of the Christian law, we are perforce reminded of the duty of self abnegation and self crucifixion. The Christian ethic in this aspect is facing the light of its life at present in face of that modern paganism which has come in like a flood. Mightier for the moment to thousands of consciences than any name of saint or Saviour is the shadow of Darwin, standing for the efficiency of the individual who has asserted and proved his ability to survive in the struggle for existence, the shadow of Nietzsche, with his scorn for the slave morality of self-suppression and self-denial.

It is not enough to say that the lower self must be denied and the higher self developed. For any sincere and honest

[1] *Culture and Restraint*, London, 1901.

nature the difficulty does not lie in the crucifixion of the lusts: it comes when the nobler part of us itself seems crucified, sacrificed and frustrated for ends which, if they exist at all, are not yet in sight. An instance perhaps makes the meaning plainer. Is it not just here that there lies the tragedy of many a woman's life? She has been taught to deny herself for the sake of others, and especially to subordinate her personal ambitions to the needs and tasks of her own home. Her brothers go out into the world, express themselves, fulfil themselves, make a name. She is held by home and its ties. She has to give herself, perhaps to her ageing parents, her outlook limited by their horizons, her duty conditioned by their needs and possibly their whims, every day the same as every other, filled with petty drudgery from dawn till dusk. What opportunity for self-expression or self-development is within her reach, compared at least to the opportunities which her brothers have enjoyed? So the chill of the years settles down upon her, and she remains a cramped soul in a cramped space. What wonder if she asks herself whether she would not have been every way bigger, better, wiser—whether she might not in the long run have been able to do more for her father and mother if self-advancement and self-development rather than self-denial had been her motive, and if, like her brothers, while time was still on her side, she had flung free?

Perhaps the Christian ethic, like the Christian Church, is now coming close to its ultimate and most serious peril in losing its hold upon women. The instance now given is very close to the line along which revolt is working in the minds of many. And some women and older girls, still attending Church and meek enough to outward seeming, are sullenly asking themselves, when the Christian pulpit talks of self-denial and self-repression, whether the preacher

is not trying to coerce them into an obedience which he would not dream of accepting for himself.

Is not the Labour world saying exactly the same thing—that it has heard too long from Squire and Parson the doctrines of humility and docility, and that its hour for self-development has come?

But for the sincere heart and sensitive conscience the crux of our problem is in a point not yet touched upon—a point which life often makes very pressing and practical. Suppose that I, to the best of my poor knowledge and ability, try to love my neighbour as myself, *do I not run the risk of injuring my neighbour* by helping to make him greedy, selfish, exacting? Take the instance last discussed—the case of the girl who gives herself with unstinted devotion to her aged parents, so truly loving them as herself that she puts their comfort above any personal desire or ambition—is there not some danger, have we not all seen the danger illustrated in actual life, of making them exacting, grasping and peevish? Or has one not seen the tendency work the other way—a gentle and unselfish father and mother producing a family of greedy and selfish children who have learned to claim all and give nothing? A very familiar instance is the case of the Christian philanthropist and how he gets preyed upon; if he sets a limit to his altruism and gives carefully and with due investigation, he may do good, but if he allows his altruistic enthusiasm to riot unchecked by prudential considerations, he will only breed a horde of parasites. The point for the moment is not the injury to the philanthropist himself—if he be a philanthropist he ought to admit that his blood is there for the purpose of shedding; the point is the injury to the moral stamina of those whom he encourages in the parasitic habit. One of the most amazing instances of this problem on the scale of the individual life is that which has recently been revealed

in the life story of Samuel Butler. Butler did not profess to be a Christian but in his relations with his friend Charles Paine Pauli he practised the altruistic law with a generosity and a protracted patience which few Christians would have shown. Pauli and he met in New Zealand, and, as Pauli was in bad health and poor, Butler paid his passage home, and promised to give him £200 a year for three years so that he might train for the Bar. Butler went on supporting Pauli for thirty-three years—from 1864 to 1897—often in penury himself, but sharing what he had with his friend. When Pauli died, Butler discovered that Pauli through most of that long time had been earning at the Bar anything from £500 to £1000 per annum: Pauli had been paying £120 a year for his rooms: Butler's rent, including rates and taxes, was only £36. Pauli left £9,000, but did not remember Butler in his will. Butler wrote of the whole matter:—

"I felt pretty sure I was doing a great deal too much, but I had rather have done a great deal too much than a little too little . . . my conscience is absolutely clear of all offence towards him, save that of having made it so deplorably easy to do things which, if I had made them harder, he would have been less likely to do."[1] What Christian could have given a more Christian verdict? And yet the point is not the injury to Butler and the way in which he took it—but the injury to the man who sinned against him and who by Butler's patience and kindness was encouraged to go on sinning until his soul must have been dead within him.

A less heroic, and even amusing, instance is found in the Autobiography of Madame Guyon in the story of her attempt to carry out the law of meekness in her own home. Her husband was ill and bad-tempered. The doctor prescribed broths and other potions which the patient disliked.

[1] *Life of Samuel Butler*, by Henry Festing Jones, II, 286 f.

Her mother-in-law and the servants would not take these things into his room for fear of his anger: his wife took them and endured the unpleasantness. But whenever anything was sent up which the patient would welcome, the mother-in-law snatched it from her hands and got all the thanks. "Love hindered me from saying anything," she plaintively adds, "and I suffered all in silence." Again we may pass over the wrong to Madame Guyon herself, but was it for the good of the fractious patient and his domineering mother that meekness should pursue its unprotesting way?

A few instances of this kind of thing—and on one scale or another in homes are continually cropping up in life—produce in some minds a fairly profound scepticism as to the Christian ethic and its healthiness even when it is put into practice.

Has the Church any answer to these things? They do not belong to the casuistry of a fugitive and cloistered virtue: they reflect very urgent perplexities before the consciences of living men and women. This article presents the problem more fully than the solution partly because the problem is plainer than the solution: the solution is meantime being wrought out. Roughly, it may be said, the solution falls into two parts—a part that is clear enough, and a part which meantime we have to take by faith rather than by sight.

(*a*) Certain things are plain by this time, and may be quickly dismissed. The way out of the *impasse* is to dig deep, and deliver ourselves from a merely superficial and sentimental conception of Christian love. The object of a love which has any ethical quality in it must be not to please but to benefit. In small matters, we have learned this from the Charity Organisation Society: in great principles, we may go to school here with St. Paul, who would have it that the business of love was to edify, and with his

Lord, whose conception of love, if we may judge from His example, was very far from the idea of giving everybody everything they asked or dealing complacently with the cruel and the selfish. A love which is either reasonable or Christian must define itself in terms of the general good, and when it finds that good being injured by its action it must revise its plans and deepen its insight.

(*b*) But when these things are admitted, the greater bulk of the problem still stretches beyond our reach and we walk by faith. In cases where the result is not plain, every Christian motive still presses and urges towards gentleness, meekness, generosity, benevolence—in short towards the spirit of the Cross. Now here, where we must act believingly, it is the business of the Christian theology to come to the help of the Christian ethic, and it must do so if the latter is to stand. The help of the theology is needed, were it only *to provide a cosmic optimism so vast and broad-based that it can transcend temporary failure.* Some of the moral objections which are being urged against the Christian law of love and meekness might be summed up pungently and terribly in the assertion that Jerusalem was the worse for the Cross. It may be quite true that Jerusalem was the worse for the Cross, hardened in her obstinacy, coarsened in her moral grain. Yet the world has been immeasurably the better for the Cross. And if Christianity be no mere historical accident but the exposition of the ultimate truth of things, then by the time the world's tale is told out to the end, the Cross will be found to have been the best thing that ever happened. If God has taken the way of love, including all its risks, can the way of love be wrong after all, even though at some points in the process the risks be painfully apparent? And in so far as the followers of Christ identify themselves with the spirit and methods of the Divine Love, must they not be content to meet their share of the risks—say the risk

of being sucked and sponged upon, the risk of being deceived and taken advantage of, the risk of seeing men grow worse instead of better before their eyes? We risk these things and tolerate them because we are possessed by an optimism cosmic in its scope and eternal in its duration, which will not allow failure to be God's last word either upon His own work or that of His servants. Our love must take pains to be as wise and thorough as it can, to seek at once the particular and the general good. But if it fails, it fails with Him, and He will succeed by and by where it has failed to-day. So the hard and perilous way of love is lightened by a promise of which the Christian theology is the only guarantee.

> I saw Lord Love upon his galley pass
> Westward from Cyprus; smooth as glass
> The sea was all before him. He, as κελευστὴς
> Stood at the stern, and piped
> The rhythms; but, ever and anon,
> As worked upon
> By some familiar Fury, grasping a scourge
> (An amethyst
> Fastened it to his wrist . . . Love's wrist!)
> He ran along the transtra, and did urge
> The rowers, and striped
> Their backs with blood; whereat they leapt
> Like maddened hounds, and swept
> The sea until it hissed.
> Then I:—
> "Lord Love, what means this cruelty?"
> But he to me
> Deigned no reply:
> Only I saw his face was wet with tears,
> And he did look beyond, and yet beyond.[1]

There is need thus to call the Christian theology to the rescue of the Christian ethic. There are some servants of love and meekness who are feeling somewhat bitterly in an age of rush and self-advertisement that the tide of recogni-

[1] T. E. Brown: *Aber Stations.*

tion ets in any direction but theirs. Exactions multiply. The more they give, the more is asked and expected of them. The loud-voiced grow louder and more contemptuous. The world is the inheritance of the aggressive; the race is to the swift, and the battle to the strong; and those whose power, like their Master's, is the power to lay down their life, have not yet reached their "third day" of vindication. Small wonder if their souls sometimes grow bitter within them. It may help them if, in the light of the Christian revelation, we can show them that there is a vicarious principle running through life, that the very Highest of all shares in it and calls them to His side, and that because He shares in it, it cannot ultimately be in vain. Its final fruit shall be a world so Christian that it shall help men and not hinder them, in the hard task of being Christians. That world is not here as yet, and for its dawning we must look "beyond and yet beyond."

J. M. E. Ross.

OUR CONCEPTION OF GOD.

It is hardly possible, as yet, for even the most pronounced optimist to claim that the world which is gradually emerging from the chaos and confusion of its greatest tragedy, is a better world. There are unmistakable signs that it is a new world. Nothing will ever be again as it was before 1914. Every relation, every activity of man has been affected in less or greater degree.

The methodical, normal process of evolution, to which we were quite comfortably accustoming ourselves, has become *per saltum* an irregular, abnormal, far other than comfortable, rush. The stream has not merely overflowed its banks but the banks themselves have been in certain

places, carried away. Man has lost his bearings. His thoughts, instead of being slowly "widened by the process of the suns" have been violently jerked and roughly jostled forward by the process of history. This premature development is everywhere noticeable. In Politics and Economics new and difficult problems present themselves to which at present no solution can be found. The clean-cut between political theories has disappeared. Manufacturers now speak of Protection: life-long upholders of privilege and of a governing class, of open diplomacy: hide-bound Tories are coquetting with forms of Nationalisation and a levy on capital.

Even the "dismal science" of Economics has been affected. Economic theories which had been signalled by the name of "laws," and thought to be as unchangeable as those of the Medes and Persians, are suspect, if not already on the scrap-heap.

It is scarcely to be expected that Philosophy and Religion should be immune. Indeed the confusion is more noticeable here than anywhere. From very strange quarters we hear of Reconstruction being dependent on Spiritual Regeneration.

In Philosophy, though the Idealist have not lost their Absolute, they are not so sure that He is so Absolute as on first thoughts He seemed to be. The Monist still believes in his "Unity," but he is not so certain about the number of sides to it, nor even whether it may not have to be stated in terms of Plurality.

What is the "Appearance" and what is the "Reality"? Life as we saw it before 1914 or as we have experienced it since?

Theology is perhaps in still worse state. "I'm a Christian all right, padre, it's what these parsons say about God that stumps me," said a wounded soldier to a chaplain. It sums

up the situation. We have no definite conception of God. We have no common doctrine of God. The traditional doctrine, derived from ideas of Oriental Monarchy, Aristotle's "Abstraction" existing in a state of static bliss, "thinking on thought," Roman Jurisprudence, and Natural Law, has no power to stir even an emotion of antagonism. When stated at all it makes confusion doubly confused. Tennyson's cry voices the thoughts of many :—

"Ah yet—I have had some glimmer, at times, in my gloomiest woe,
Of a God behind all—after all—the great God for aught that I know;
But the God of Love and of Hell together—they cannot be thought;
If there be such a God, may the great God curse him and bring him to nought."

The real source of the difficulty, theologically and religiously, is, as Canon Wilson has said, to be found in our conception of God—or rather our lack of conception. Without a clear conception of God Christianity loses its dynamic. The Theist may rest satisfied with a personal force behind all things: Christian Faith stands or falls on its conception of this personal force. It is his conception of God that gives the Christian the standard of his ethic: that determines his view of man; that settles for him the very meaning of history. It is for him the dominating fact, the fact by which he interprets all other facts. With this alone is he able to confront pain, sin, death, and "the burden of this unintelligible world." Some final authority, some final reference, the human mind must have, otherwise, what have been called "the three terms of thought"—the World, Self, God—fall asunder and pessimism alone remains. The following words, from Studdert Kennedy's little book *The Hardest Part* repay quotation.

"As the minds of men develop they become less and less afraid, and more determined to prove all things and hold fast only that which is true. Everywhere this tendency can be traced in history. Com-

bined with a deep and pathetic longing for an absolute authority and an infallible guide, there is this critical faculty which prevents us from resting satisfied with false absolutes. Men tried an infallible Church, and the critical faculty tore it to pieces after the Renaissance: they tried an infallible Bible, and the nineteenth century science cast it into a den of critics whose mouths could not be closed. They have tried infallible monarchies again and again and seen them torn to bits."

The writer might have added, "They have tried an infallible God and found that there is no voice nor any that answers." He does add, "We can no longer interpret ultimate reality in the terms of absolute monarchy if we are to reach the heart of men." The same writer tells us that "Science has not really answered a single ultimate question." Most thinkers would say that Science cannot. But it is very doubtful whether orthodox theology has ever really done so. Indeed, at the present moment, when men are looking for some kind of a working answer to such questions, the theologians have none to offer. With the conception of God in confusion theology is left without a doctrine of the Incarnation and the Cross, with no doctrine of moral restoration, no doctrine of the hereafter. What is urgently needed, and, one might add, what is most seriously going on is Reinterpretation. New light must be thrown upon old truth. It is not really the facts that are questioned but their interpretation. There must too be an unveiling of truths not formerly seen.

The traditional conception of God, which is neither philosophical nor Christian, and with it other central doctrines of the Church, is undergoing a searching examination in which both microscope and scalpel are being used. The lens of the microscope is now a new and more powerful one, and it is revealing accretions to which the knife must be fearlessly applied if the subject under examination is to continue in correspondence with environment. It is admitted that

such correspondence is vital in the case of an organism. Surely it is equally vital in the case of Thought and Action! God is verily not a God of the dead but of the living. The time has come when it is necessary to enquire concerning any theory in religion, in philosophy, in science, in politics, in economics, does it work? If it does, though possibly the pragmatic test is not ultimate, there is a sufficient indication of living force.

It is just this charge which is urged from very different sides against orthodox theology and the Christianity of the Churches. It is out of touch, it does not discern the signs of the times, it is not in correspondence with environment, it is no longer a living force. It is therefore unable to supply an ultimate sanction to our ethic or to exercise a modifying influence upon the ideas and policies round which the life of societies revolve, it has left man without sure standing-place for his soul.

If we ask in what respect thinkers are trying to bring their conception of God into vital correspondence with environment, the answer may be briefly stated. God is to be thought of rather as finite than Infinite. It is no longer possible to conceive of Omnipotence in terms – as Pringle-Pattison expresses it – "of the tawdry happenings of regal pomp and physical force." His action is conditioned. Limitation besets Him on every side, a limitation that is part of His character.

We cannot speak of God as self-centred, self-involved, dwelling in a sort of "static bliss." There is a sense in which we may speak of His growth, His increase. Professor Sanday illustrates the lines upon which the examination is proceeding in his *Divine Overruling* (1920).

". . . the true divine is not to be sought in the abnormal, though for long ages the tendency had been to think that it was . . . God is consistent with Himself; He respects His own laws; they describe His permanent mode of action."

What, it may be asked, is the particular environment with which our conception of God must correspond? For some the only possible criterion is the faith and practice of the Church. Others demand that whatever re-interpretation is made must be in correspondence with the intellectual, spiritual and moral outlook of our time. Neither of these, however, will afford an ultimate criterion of the value of the conceptions now slowly being formulated. The doctrine of the Church was not even presented as a positive statement of the living faith of the Church during the creed-making period. The creeds were rather negative than positive in their origin, an attempt to *deny* certain heresies than to *affirm* final doctrine. While the conception of God, though it must be stated in terms of our intellectual outlook, will surely be the standard and test of that outlook.

For the Christian, the standard of value, the final criterion of the conception of God, the environment with which any fresh formulation must correspond is the Incarnation, the revelation of God in the life and character and teaching of Christ. More and more are we coming to see that we must speak of God in terms of Christ rather than of Christ in terms of God. The Incarnation itself and the Incarnate Life are for us the environment with which our conception of God must correspond.[1]

Our object here is to draw attention to this mode of re-interpreting God. A careful study of the life, character and teaching of Jesus offers support—we venture to think strong support—to the conception of God outlined above. Still

[1] "Obviously then, any serious attempt to make the new social order Christian must be accompanied by a rediscovery of the Christian God, and that means that we must turn from the philosophers and sentimentalists and intellectuals and social idealists, and endeavour to comprehend "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," revealed to us not only in what Jesus said, but also in what He was and did." "The Need of a New Conception of God," Andrew Gillies, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*. April, 1919.

stronger, indeed conclusive, support comes from a deeper study of the implications of the Incarnation itself, in contradistinction to the Incarnate Life.

Let us think first of the latter. Everywhere we see limitation and development. It is hardly necessary to point out how general is the acceptance which a more enlightened observation has freely given in our own day to these two qualifying influences in our Lord's life. And this has been granted not on the grounds of expediency or accommodation, but because these two characteristics may be clearly discovered in the extant records of that wonderful life. His mental development is insisted upon equally with His physical growth. We even speak of His consciousness of divine sonship as coming to Him gradually. His knowledge was acquired, conditioned, and in certain respects strictly limited. There were things of which He Himself admitted ignorance. His actions also are often represented as conditioned and limited by His environment. He suffered, apparently, from all the ills that flesh is heir to. He was weary, hungry, thirsty, disappointed, deceived, grieved at heart, *tempted in all points*, agonised in prayer, tortured, crucified, dead and buried. It is the life of a man living and dying among men which the records have preserved for us. Yet we are told it is the life of one who said, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father."

His constant practice of prayer is specially noteworthy. His prayers are not only conditioned by God's will but seem to imply that the will of God is conditioned by circumstances of which the suppliant may be ignorant. A deeper analysis of the meaning of the Gethsemane prayer "If it be possible let this cup pass from Me" suggests the conclusion that Jesus was conscious that though God might be willing to let the cup pass He might be unable to do so. There is a possible implication, at least, of limitation in God Himself.

The teaching of Jesus seems to hint at limitation in God, especially the parables.

The Sower is successful in one only of four given cases. The Tares, though here both soil and seed are good, play havoc amongst the wheat—"An enemy hath done this." Is not the condemnation of the man with the one talent very suggestive? The man failed to develop the possibilities latent in what he had, and God is helpless so far as that one talent was concerned. The Ten Virgins, the Prodigal Son, the Great Supper, have all the same underlying conception.

Consider the Beatitudes. The general idea of the ideal state which earns the blessing is that of suffering and limitation. Nevertheless the command given was, "Be ye perfect as your Father in Heaven is perfect." All through the implication is that perfection is not an unchangeable impassibility but just the capacity to suffer and yet retain the will for good: the clean, hopeful, forgiving heart. Here is the nearest approach to the perfection demanded. Yet the perfection of the Father cannot be different in essence from that of the children.

Professor Mackintosh writes (*Expositor*, Nov. 1918):

". . . the chief opponent of the new theory is not, as participants in the controversy occasionally seem to think, traditional theology, but the religious faith of the Bible and specially of Jesus, so far from questioning O.T. teaching as to the sublimity and omnipotence of God, Jesus, if possible, laid on it a deeper stress."

If Professor Mackintosh means by "omnipotence of God" the all-compelling power of love, we have nothing to say. But if, as he implies, Christ laid a deeper stress on the traditional conception, then the facts as interpreted above do not justify this statement.

Whatever force may be derived from consideration of the life and teaching of Jesus is immensely increased by the implications of the Incarnation itself.

Professor Pringle Pattison in his Gifford Lectures on "The Idea of God" complains bitterly of the manner in which the implications of the doctrine of the Incarnation have been evaded in popular theology. The evasion is most marked in reference to the conception of God. Yet it is the Incarnation to which Christian Theology must look for its final doctrine of God. What kind of God, then, does the necessity of the Incarnation imply?

Whatever else the Incarnation may mean it manifests a self-impartation of God. If this self-impartation is to have any moral and religious value it must have been necessitated not merely by the external stimulus of man's need for salvation. In other words, the Cross is not the *raison d'être* of the Incarnation. The Incarnation is necessitated by the very nature of God. God is Love. Love finds its perfection in losing one's life to save it—in dying to live. From all eternity must God have been striving to reveal Himself and by such revelation help man to achieve a personality in essence like His own. The Incarnation thus becomes a manifestation in time of an eternal act—the self-impartation of God. But why is this manifestation delayed until the birth of Jesus? Its delay is a proof of God's limitation. His power, being an all-compelling love could use no other means, it was limited by man's capacity to receive. If this is a correct inference we are able to get rid altogether of the notion that the Incarnation was an act of God to put things right that had gone wrong—an attempt to rectify a miscalculation. It was nothing of the kind. The fulness of time had come at last, when man's capacity enabled God to impart Himself fully in and through man. The Incarnation offers us the picture of One eternally struggling with man's slowly developing capacity to reveal Himself. In the Incarnation we see Him sharing our pain and suffering, our joys and sorrows, identifying Himself with our finitude,

revealing Himself more fully, that we may be enabled to behold Him face to face. We get here, at any rate, a starting-point for a conception of God. A God who is not a mere spectator of man's struggle, but is Himself a struggling, "*trying*" God, a word which the Bishop of London uses in his preface to Professor McNeil's little book *The Increase of God*. It is just this word "trying" that differentiates the new conception from the old, and it is the Incarnation that offers the best proof of it. What has man to-day to do with a God who knows not the meaning nor the necessity for struggle, who knows not the disappointment of failure, who has not felt the burden of limitation, to whom the experience of effort is unknown? In quite a reverent yet definitely modern and true sense, what men are looking for now, what they really need, is a God who shares in the human struggle, who is touched with a feeling of our infirmities, who is, in *all* points, proved like as we are.

But this is just what a true doctrine of the Incarnation gives us, just what a deeper and more careful study of the Incarnate Life impresses upon us.

The Father is essentially as the Son. "I and My Father are One."

HENRY C. A. TOWNSEND.
JOHN G. MCKENZIE.

NOTE.—We may reverently say that if God is good, if He is loving, if He looks upon men as His children—in a word, if He is like Christ—He *must* in some sense suffer in or with His creatures, and the more intensely in proportion to their nearness and dearness and likeness to Himself.

A God who could contemplate such a world as ours without suffering would not be a loving God, nor would He be in the least like Christ. God must suffer with and in the sufferings of all His creatures.—RASHDALL, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, p. 453.

AN HARD SAYING.

"But Jesus saith unto him: Follow Me, and leave the dead to bury their own dead."—*St. Matthew* viii. 22.

MANY a time have I looked at this text and thought to speak of it; but I have always ended by looking for a subject elsewhere. Why trouble to clear up the difficulties in one saying of Jesus, when there are so many sayings of Jesus with which it is so much more comfortable to deal, which also are free from any obscurity! But I have always felt that that was a feeble and disingenuous attitude. Sometimes indeed I have told myself that perhaps the thing that was really keeping me from going into this saying of Jesus was simply that I myself did not like it—and this because it seemed to make a demand of us all which I for my own part was not ready, or at least not eager, to meet. And yet one can say quite honestly that it was not that only and in one's better moments not that at all which kept one from dealing directly and honestly with these words of Jesus. In recent years and at this very moment good and serious men have no faith in easy and plausible solutions; and any one who offers us a cheap and comfortable formula for dealing with life, though he may have a vogue with the groundlings, announces himself in the view of thoughtful people as either a fool or a knave.

"It is by no breath,
Turn of eye, wave of hand, that salvation joins issue with death!"

Infinite mischief has been done by the spread of the idea that somehow Christianity helps those who profess it either to shut their eyes to difficulties and embarrassments in their own personal life and in the general life of man, or recommends for the treatment of such difficulties and embarrassments a process which works easily, like magic.

Whereas the fact is, Christ made the severest appeal that ever reached the soul of man; and He supposed that He had put the very heart of His meaning beyond all doubt by accepting for Himself the cruelty and disgrace of the Cross.

And yet it was not the severity of our Lord's words here, which, unless in one's bad hours, kept one from a frank and hearty consideration of them. What rather estranged one, and made one uneasy—so that he was glad to think of the blessed abundance of genial and sympathetic things which Jesus also said—was, that in this particular saying of His as it stands and as it strikes us on a first reading, there is a something which, had the words been spoken by another, we should have pronounced harsh and indeed inhuman. "Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father"; "Follow me, and leave the dead to bury their own dead." There is something there which, had it come from other lips, we should have resented.

Of course there are those of a fanatical and excited temper who will have no difficulty. These will say, "There are the words of Jesus; you must take them or leave them!" There are those who will even say that we do wrong to try to understand words spoken by our Lord in any sense beyond the obvious sense. And there is something quite just in that. We must take care not to try to bring truth down to our level, but rather to raise ourselves to the level of truth, and give ourselves no rest until we are there. But this is not to say that we are not to try to understand words of Jesus which seem to conflict with some deep and elementary moral principle or human piety. If, on a first reading, those words seem to us harsh, if they seem to open the door to a certain unfeelingness and cruelty, we are bound out of regard even to the moral majesty of Jesus so to grasp His intention that we shall acknowledge

with our whole being -with our heart and mind alike—that even in this strange utterance He is worthy of Himself and is asking of us something which, far from being contrary to man's higher nature, is indeed its consecration and its crown.

In approaching any word of Jesus which seems hard and not obviously in harmony with His Great Charity, we shall of course naturally and instinctively take care always to keep the particular thing (which is troubling us) well within the circle of His Infinite Love for us, which is the general and habitual effect upon us of our Faith in Him. It is a very poor kind of love which goes off at a word. "Love is not love," says Shakespeare, "which alters when it alteration finds." And still less is *that* love which leaps to some wretched conclusion on the basis of something which, were we determinedly kind, is capable of some innocent or even beautiful interpretation. "Love taketh no account of evil," says St. Paul. Love, that is to say, has a note-book with pages and pages on which grounds of offence or anger or suspicion are to be entered with the very date and the very hour: but when you open love's note book, you find those pages clean and empty! "Love keeps no record of the Evil."

When Jesus says something which sounds to me harsh, or something which, had another said it, I might have pronounced even cruel, I am to say to myself: "No, whatever I may *end* by thinking of those particular words of His, I am not going to call them harsh or cruel. For He could never be cruel, or encourage in the human heart anything even unkind, who said all the other wonderful things which He did say, and who crowned all by laying down His life in sheer love of us, and with the hope of making us good."

Is not that how we act towards any human being whom

we have had great reason to trust, or any human being whom we ever truly loved? When something appears in one in whom we trust or whom we love, something which, at a glance, or as it comes to us in some vague rumour, conflicts with that best of him which we have seen and known on some fine occasion or in the intercourse of years, we should be despicable creatures, unworthy of the great name of man, were we to let that one thing poison our life, forgetting in a wave of anger or petulance the tenderness of some earlier day or the steady fidelity of a long companionship.

I say we should not, unless we are no better than spoiled children, behave in such a way towards another human soul which in its love or in its trustfulness had ever opened itself to ours. And it is one way of stating the whole mind of Christ to say that He, Christ, asks us to shew the same loyalty, the same belief, the same resoluteness to put the fine interpretation upon those things in His own testimony and in the Providence of God which may cast a momentary shadow, or interrupt for an instant or for a day or even for many years the radiance of His obvious and incontrovertible goodness.

Taking this incident as we have it and not trying in any way to soften the apparent harshness of our Lord's words, it is possible for us to justify that harshness.

We who are alive to-day are well aware that a situation may arise in which the language used here by our Lord —abrupt and unrelenting as it is— is the only language that is possible. There may be something impending so grave, and, should it come to pass, so irretrievable, that any language is to be approved, however fierce and unbending, which has the effect of arousing a dull mind to the approaching peril. And we know that there are circumstances in which even the dearest human

and natural duties must wait or for the time being be abandoned, so that a man may rush to his place to defend some larger interest—the safety of his country, for example, or the life of another human being which he perceives to be threatened. We should none of us justify or excuse a man allowing a child to drown or to be ill-treated by a ruffian on the ground that the man was in an honest hurry, or was even on the way to his father's funeral. Even *we* should say that in this world there are moments in which something may leap up in front of a man and to that he must attend or fall into contempt. And if the words of Jesus in this place serve to remind us all that there are calls, demands, duties which may suddenly register themselves in a man's conscience, and that to these he must pay heed even if for the time or even for ever he has to neglect home and kindred —it was well that these words were spoken.

Of course, the severity of Jesus here would be very happily explained, for it would be explained away, if the man to whom our Lord spoke with such sharpness was at the moment simply a fraud. If he was trying to deceive Jesus, and to deceive himself, giving as a reason what he himself knew was only an excuse, why in that case no words could be too severe. If he was at heart and bottom a good man, or if he ever became a good man, he would thank Jesus later on for having pulled him up so suddenly and for having compelled him to look at himself in such a faithful mirror.

Still, when all is said, it is a great relief to me to believe that what I have been calling a certain harshness in this reply of our Lord can be explained. The fact is Jesus did not say the very thing which alone gives what He did say its appearance of unfeelingness.

When this man—a disciple he was—came to Jesus and

said, "Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father," something like the following is what for myself I used to think of his position.

I imagined that here was a disciple of Jesus, a man who had been listening to the teaching of Jesus day by day, making what he could of it; and now Jesus was inviting him and others to commit themselves more definitely to His cause; to take on some new responsibility. Just at that very moment—this was what I used to think—news came to this poor man—for in those days my sympathies were rather with him—that his father, an old and lonely man I pictured him, had died, and summoning the son to his home, were it only to give his father a decent burial. That was what I supposed had taken place. That being so, Jesus, our Lord, from whose lips came the great words and ideas on which all our later good-manners and pieties have been founded, Jesus, in His reply to a disciple who had lost his father, was actually forbidding him to go home for a day or two days or a week it might be, to follow the old man's body to its last resting-place!

I somehow did not like that story; and seeing no way of softening the harshness of it, I was content to let it alone. Of course, later I knew what the commentators had to say about it who just here are as busy as ants. But their ideas were so far-fetched and sometimes so amusing that they did nothing to ease my mind.

And yet it is all so simple; and what Jesus did say, in the circumstances as I see them now, is so obviously right and necessary and the very voice of a redeeming God to any man in the same circumstances, that a story which I used to avoid is now one which I know I dare not neglect. It so hurts me and heals me and summons me, it so deals with the human soul at the particular stage which my own soul has reached, and in view of the outstanding peril of

men of my own age, that this is a place which I must frequent or in some precious matters consent to die.

The fact is, the man's father was not dead. Perhaps he lived for many years after this story. Perhaps he had time himself to become a Christian before he died, in which case he would many a time rally his son on this story. But certainly, the fact is he was not at this time dead. And so, we may banish from our minds all sad pictures of an old man lying unburied, and his son, his only son perhaps, his eldest son certainly, not being allowed by Jesus to go home for a day to see his body laid to rest. Fancy us thinking that Jesus could do a thing like that!

No, here is the whole story. When this disciple asked leave to go home and bury his father, he was making use of a phrase which everybody in his day who spoke his language immediately understood. He meant simply, "Master, my father is still alive; and, as Thou knowest, it is my duty as his son to stand by him, to see him out of life. Thou knowest the law of Moses, and the sacred habits of our people. Thou rememberest how it comforted Jacob as an old man to know that it would be the hands of his own son which would lower his body to the grave. That is my position. I have a father. I do not say he is at this moment dying, still less do I say that he is dead and unburied; but one day he will die. And so, Lord, I feel that I am not free to go about with Thee until my father is in fact dead."

To which our Lord replied in effect: That is to say, you suggest to me that you yourself cannot begin to be a man, and to assume the status and responsibility of a man, until your father is dead! Is that what you conceive your part in life to be—to do nothing of your very own, nothing out of the tumult or vision of your own soul, nothing for life as you with your own eyes see it, until your father dies?

But suppose your father reaches the average term which God has set to a human life—seventy or seventy-five or eighty let it be. By that time you will be a man of fifty or sixty—past your best, having lived down your own best hours and thwarted all those great proposals of God that come to us one by one in our youth and first manhood. Do you propose to do nothing distinct and individual, nothing but hang about the old place, watching the time pass, until you reach an age at which all the dreamers, poets, artists, and formers of the world's best life have already and long since done their greatest and truest work? Are you content to make of your life—and this in the season when it is most fresh and daring—nothing but a dreary waiting for the burial of a relative? And when that day comes, your father dead and buried, what then of you? Do you suppose that a man of fifty or fifty-five or sixty—and one who like you has felt the summons to a definite and daring life and has suppressed that summons and many another fine uprising in his own soul, do you suppose that all at once you are going to be a hero, a worker, a striver on behalf of threatened causes, a seeker-out of danger, with blood throbbing in your veins and knocking at your brain searching for some costly outlet? If so, you deceive yourself. A man has himself as he uses himself. And at fifty or fifty-five or sixty—in the region of our physical and moral nature alike—the bills begin to come in to which we put our careless signature in the unthinking earlier days.

No, sir. You have a chance, and your chance is now. If a man is ever going to be a great man, or a good man, or, as we say, a man, he must begin to be that very thing here and now. And as for your father, the greatest honour you can do him is by so living now that he will be proud that he begat you.

Once more, you have your chance. And it is here and

now. It may be that through all eternity forces have been working towards this very point, this diamond-point in human history, when you should stand before Me, feeling the call of something within you about which you do not know much except this: that it seems to you to be true, fine, great, difficult—in fact the very thing you came into life for. There you stand, poised between two careers, at the cross-roads, and your next step is going to lead on a step still further in the same direction, and that to another and another until the end.

You are now arrived at that keen edge of personal feeling where for the first time a man deals with God and his own soul. I congratulate you on having reached your own great hour. For myself I see only one way to make your great hour great indeed. There is through this life of ours a high road and there is a low road. I plead with you to obey your spirit's highest impulse. Follow Me. As for your old father, if you really ever meant anything by bringing him in, have no fear. God who has cared so much for you as to steer and guide you towards this great moment, will see that your old father shares in the blessedness that is offering itself to you.

Wherefore, "arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the Glory of the Lord is risen upon thee!"

JOHN A. HUTTON.

HISTORY AND HOMILETICS: A STUDY IN 2 SAMUEL XXI. 1–14.

THERE are two approaches to the Bible—the historical and the homiletic. The historian, as historian, is interested in fact, not in edification, except in the broad sense in which all historical fact may be said to edify: the preacher, on the other hand, is interested in edification rather than in fact. An admirable history of Israel might be written by a scholar who could not preach at all, just as an edifying and, in its own way, effective sermon might be delivered from a historical passage by a preacher who had made no careful critical examination of the facts upon which he rests his exposition and appeals. But an ideal treatment of a Biblical narrative demands scrupulous attention to history and edification alike: neither the merely historical nor the merely homiletic can ever be adequate.

For the Bible is, above all things, *religious* literature; this is as true of the historical books—alike of the Old Testament and the New—as it is of the prophetic books or the epistles. Facts are never recorded merely for what they are, but for what they signify: they are related not simply or chiefly to instruct and inform, but to inspire, to warn, to present and justify the ways of God to men, to kindle faith in the divine control of history, to illumine the path of duty for men and nations, to teach that fear of the Lord which is the beginning and the essence of wisdom, to furnish the man of God completely unto every good work. The moral and religious purpose which controls, for example,

the Book of Proverbs, and is deliberately expressed in its elaborate preface, controls, if not so obviously, yet no less surely, the selection and presentation of the facts recorded in the historical books of the Bible. The men who wrote them wrote as preachers or evangelists rather than as historians. Of Israel's conquest of Canaan the psalmist can say,

> We have heard with our ears, O God,
> Our fathers have told us,
> *What work Thou didst* in their days,
> In the days of old (Ps. xliv. 1).

And this is the consistent attitude of the historians no less than of the poets.

Considered simply as history, many of the narratives are almost ludicrously meagre. Two of the longest and most important reigns in Israel and Judah, covering over forty years, are dismissed in fourteen verses (2 Kings xiv. 23–xv. 7)—verses, too, which are largely expressed in schematic language, and which would leave us in exasperating ignorance of those reigns, were it not that we are able to fill in their outlines from the vivid pages of Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. The truth is that the editors are not, in the strict sense, historians at all: they are preachers, pleading for God with their readers as the prophets with their hearers, pleading through the vehicle of history as they through the vehicle of oratory, and sublimely indifferent to all facts which they conceive to be irrelevant to that plea. It is, of course, legitimate and indeed necessary for a modern historian of Israel to pierce beneath this religious presentation of the history to the ultimate historical facts, so far as he can discover or recover them by the critical and other means at his disposal: but an adequate treatment of a historical section by a commentator is impossible unless he takes into serious account the fact that what he is dealing

with is a *religious* presentation of history, and unless he as faithfully endeavours to set forth the religion which inspires it as the history which underlies it. It is at this point that most commentators fail.

But an equal obligation lies upon the preacher to understand the history from which he professes to draw his moral, and it is at this point that most preachers fail. From the very nature of his calling, which exposes him to the almost irresistible temptation to leap at an obvious moral, the preacher tends to develop the homiletic mind at the expense of his historical conscience. He is professionally more interested in religious edification than in historical truth, and he has seldom the inclination, even if he has the time, to subject a promising narrative to a severely critical examination. He may even have had the mortifying experience of seeing a brave sermon, of which he was about to deliver his soul, wither at the touch of strict exegesis. In any case he may feel that this quest is not for him and that he may, with a good conscience, confine himself to the moral of his story, without too strictly considering its historical truth or implications. And he may do this the more readily as there is plenty of Biblical warrant for such an attitude. The Chronicler is the supreme illustration of the tendency to prefer edification to fact, or even to secure edification at the expense of fact. He frequently treats the statements which he finds in his sources with naïve and sovereign freedom, modifying and transforming them to suit the moral which he makes it his business to point, and creating, by these modifications and transformations, a much simpler and smoother conception of the divine government of the world than is yielded by the stubborn facts themselves. But the preacher who adopts this facile method pays a double penalty: he loses that vivid conception of the facts and forces of the old Hebrew world by which

alone it can become truly intelligible, interesting, and significant to the modern man, and he misses the intellectual and spiritual stimulus which a genuine contact with fact is supremely fitted to convey. The preacher has nothing to lose and much to gain from the careful and critical study of a historical narrative. When this preliminary work is done, he breathes an atmosphere of reality, and he moves with confidence from point to point of his exposition, because there is firm ground beneath his feet. The historical and the homiletic are not strictly separable. The preacher's first business is to try to understand what happened: then, and not till then, is he fully equipped to do justice to the religious implications of the story. His task at this point may take one of two forms: either he may set forth the moral and religious truths which the narrative directly suggests to his own mind, or—and this is a peculiarly fruitful exercise—he may seek to penetrate the mind of the narrator and to recapture the religious ideas which were precious to him and which made him write just so and not otherwise. In this spiritual quest we attain to a genuine communion of souls.

As an illustration of this twofold interest of Biblical narrative, the historical and the homiletic, let us consider the story in 2 Samuel xxi. 1–14 of the extermination of Saul's descendants in accordance with the demand of the oracle which had been consulted to explain the cause of a famine that had visited the land for three successive years. It is worthy of note, to begin with, that this story was originally suppressed. It occurs in a section of curiously heterogeneous contents (2 Sam. xxi.–xxiv.), which manifestly interrupts the narrative of David's later years: the real sequel of 2 Samuel xx. is 2 Kings i. f. The interpolated section, which is of great interest, contains two poems,

lists of David's mighty men, with some account of their exploits—in particular the beautiful tale that gathers round the water of the well of Bethlehem—and two longer narratives, that under consideration (xxi. 1-14), and the other, which closes the book, dealing with David's census of the people and its tragic result (or, historically considered, rather its sequel) in a pestilence which destroyed thousands of the people (xxiv.). Much of this material is historically valuable and unquestionably ancient. It is to this section, for example, that we owe the important information, so significantly modified by the Chronicler (1 Chron. xx. 5), that Goliath was slain, not, as the picturesque later midrash affirms (1 Sam. xvii.) by David, but by another person altogether, Elhanan (2 Sam. xxi. 19). The two longer narratives in chapters xxi. and xxiv., which illustrate in their ancient way the melancholy but indubitable truth that peoples have to pay a bitter price for the mistakes and crimes of their rulers, furnish a vivid glimpse into the world of ancient religious ideas, and are, especially chap. xxi., of great historical value: even chap. xxiv., where the bent of the "religious" historian is more in evidence, contains the valuable notice of David's census and the pestilence. It is fortunate that all this material has been preserved though put together in this interpolated section in such heterogeneous fashion. But the question remains: why was it originally omitted or suppressed?

Each element of the section has to be examined on its own merits. Conceivably, for example, the psalm of David (chap. xxii.), which is duplicated with slight variations in Psalm xviii., was not in existence when the first edition of the book was published: in other words, if that poem, as some scholars believe, is, at least in its present form, post-exilic, it was *added* by the later editor, and words like suppression or omission are beside the mark. But there is every reason

to believe that the narratives at least represent ancient material, and therefore were in all probability familiar to, and accessible to, the earlier editor of the book. The story, told as early as 2 Samuel ix., of David's desire to shew kindness to any surviving member of the family of Saul: the question, "Is there yet any left of the house of Saul, that I may shew him kindness for Jonathan's sake?" with the answer that Mephibosheth, Jonathan's son, still survives, implying that he is the only survivor: these things put it beyond all doubt that the destruction of Saul's other descendants has already been consummated, and that chapter xxi. chronologically precedes chapter ix. In that case it is as good as certain that chapter xxi. has been deliberately suppressed by the earlier editor of the book.

What significance can be attached to this fact? Was there something in the story from which, with his mature and sensitive mind, he instinctively recoiled—something affecting either the character of David or the temper of primitive Hebrew religion? When we remember that the completed book, even in its earliest form, was, like Judges and Kings, shaped under Deuteronomic influences and therefore hardly earlier than the sixth century B.C., it becomes possible to suppose that the editor's moral sense was offended by the summary execution of seven innocent men in expiation of the offence of one guilty man. This was in direct contravention of the law of Deuteronomy (xxiv. 16) that "the children shall not be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin." Ezekiel (xviii. and xxxiii.) very vigorously emphasised this principle of individual retribution—"the soul that sinneth, *it* shall die" (xviii. 4); and the effect of the recognition of this principle is seen in the modification of early stories, such as that of Achan, where the penalty, which, according to ancient law, fell not only upon him,

but upon his family (Josh. vii. 15, 24, 25*b*) is limited by *v.* 25*a* to the offender himself: the later conscience was manifestly offended by the flagrant injustice of the earlier law. But this great ethical advance did not succeed in entirely defeating or extruding the older conception: side by side with it there persisted to the latest times the idea of the family rather than the individual as the real unit, and therefore the legitimate object of retribution for the offence of one of its members. The books of Daniel and Esther, which probably both belong to the second century B.C., and are perhaps the very latest in the Old Testament, attest the tenacity of this idea. Not only the accusers of Daniel, but their wives and children as well, are thrown into the lions' den (Dan. vi. 24); and not only is Haman hanged upon the gallows, but his ten sons are slain as well (Esth. ix. 10, 13, 14; cf. John ix. 2). The long persistence of this primitive belief side by side with the more generous one renders it, on the whole, improbable that the editor discarded the story of the destruction of Saul's descendants because he was ashamed of it, as in conflict with a higher and humaner law. Apparently we must seek the cause of its suppression elsewhere.

May we look for it in the historian's desire to relieve the character of David of an odious blemish? This method of dealing with awkward facts was certainly not unknown to ancient historians. In this department the Chronicler's treatment of David is a masterpiece: the King's adultery with Bathsheba and his cruel and cunning plot for the removal of Uriah are passed over in significant silence. The priestly writer's accounts of the patriarchs are also governed by the same tendency to ignore the inconvenient and to display, with the minimum of tarnish, the great fathers of the past. In his narrative, for example, Jacob, when he leaves home, is not fleeing from the vengeance of the

brother whom he has deceived, but has been sent by Isaac to take a wife of his own kinsfolk (Gen. xxviii. 1 f.). Considering this practice, therefore, of later historians, there is nothing intrinsically improbable in the view that the story in question was originally suppressed because of the lurid light it cast upon the conduct of David. Towards the end of the monarchy, if not indeed earlier, David had begun to be idealised, and tales which militated against this idealisation could, it might be argued, be not unfairly eliminated.

This consideration drives us back upon a close examination of the story which fortunately the later editor, for whatever reason, decided to transmit to posterity. It is told with all the economy of Old Testament narrative, and it incidentally raises several questions which we cannot definitely answer, but in the discussion of which we must exercise our historical imagination. "There was a famine in the days of David three years, year after year: and David sought the face of Jehovah." The implication is that the famine is a sign of Jehovah's anger, as frequently in the Old Testament (cf. Amos. iv. 6), and that the cause of that anger, if discovered, may be removed. To discover it, David "sought the face of Jehovah," and not in vain, for "Jehovah said, 'There is blood upon Saul and upon his house, because he slew the Gibeonites.'" An average modern reader, innocent of scientific method and interested only in edification, will probably take this to mean that David consulted his God in prayer and received some divinely communicated answer: but the real meaning of it is, as we see from similar passages (cf. 1 Sam. xxiii. 9 f., xxx. 7 f.), that he consulted his God and received an answer *by means of an oracle*, usually an ephod, which was in the custody of the priest.

The question now arises: what oracle did David consult? We are not told: but the answer of the oracle, which is so manifestly interested in avenging the Gibeonites, makes it

practically certain that it was the oracle at Gibeon, the modern el-Jib, about five or six miles north-west of Jerusalem. Here there was a famous sanctuary, a sanctuary so famous that it was to it that Solomon resorted at the beginning of his reign to offer sacrifice—"for that was the great high place" (1 Kings iii. 4)—and it was in it that Jehovah appeared to him in a dream, promising him, as the story ran, not only the wisdom for which he had prayed, but riches and honour as well (1 Kings iii. 4–15). Now why did the oracle interpret the famine as it did? Nothing, indeed, was more natural than that it should ascribe the calamity to sin: this was in accordance with the interpretation of suffering which generally prevailed till the writer of Job hurled his titanic protest against it: but the significant point is that the sin to which the Gibeonite oracle traced the famine is a sin *against the Gibeonites themselves*, and it is further significant that the oracle unhesitatingly names Saul as the specific author of the outrage which had brought on the calamity. The answer of the oracle was apparently, therefore, governed by two motives—to avenge the Gibeonites and to get rid of the descendants of Saul. Who, then, were the people who may conceivably have been animated by these motives? Were the Gibeonites equally influenced by both motives, or, in their answer that Saul is guilty, with the implication that his descendants must be exterminated, are we to look for the influence of another mind? In other words, was the religious motive that determined the oracle's answer governed by political considerations emanating from another quarter?

Professor George A. Barton, in his *Religion of Israel* (p. 82), suggests that the oracle "was manipulated by the Gibeonite priesthood." Certainly that priesthood had reasons of its own, thoroughly satisfactory to the primitive religious mind, for desiring and suggesting the extermination

of Saul's descendants. The narrative itself, which one could wish had been much fuller, tells us that Saul "had sought to smite the Gibeonites in his zeal for the children of Israel": he was the man that "consumed us and thought to destroy us that we should not remain in all the border of Israel" (xxi. 2, 5). Unfortunately there is no record of the incident or incidents to which this passage alludes, but it has been acutely suggested that the reference may be, in the first instance, to the massacre of the priests at Nob recorded in 1 Samuel xxii. The late Professor Cheyne, assuming that Gibeon, not Nob,[1] should be read in 1 Samuel xxi. 1 (2), xxii. 9, 11, 19, remarks, "We cannot suppose that the priests of the sanctuary of Gibeon at the time of the massacre were Israelites. They must surely have been Gibeonites, and the fact that the Gibeonite priests aided and abetted David was probably the excuse which Saul urged for decimating the Gibeonite population."[2] If this ingenious assumption be correct, there is a certain grim propriety in the execution of Saul's descendants taking place "in Gibeon on the mount of Jehovah,"[3] that is, on the very site where, by command of Saul, the priests had been massacred. But whether this be the initial specific offence or not, it is enough that Gibeonites suffered violence at the hands of Saul; and as this was in flagrant contravention of an earlier treaty between Gibeon and Israel recorded in the humorous story of Joshua ix., the Gibeonites had adequate motives of their own, considering the solidarity of the family with the individual, for desiring and demanding the destruction of Saul's descendants, since death had removed Saul himself beyond their reach.

But while we need not travel beyond the Gibeonites

[1] Cf. *Encycl. Bib.* iii. 3429 f. [2] *Encycl. Bib.* ii. 1717.

[3] So, by the simple change of *bhir* into *bhar*, reading with LXX (B) Gibeon (cf. *v.* 9), and omitting, with two MSS., Saul: instead of the received reading "in Gibeah of Saul, the chosen of Jehovah."

in search of an adequate motive for the answer of the oracle, we cannot lightly dismiss from our minds the consideration that the disappearance of Saul's descendants was an immense political convenience to David; and, however reluctantly, historical method compels us to raise the question: is it possible that the oracle was suborned by David? A malicious critic might be inclined to stress the fact that Gibeon was the oracle which David elected to consult. Were there not other sanctuaries with skilled and intelligent priests from whom he might have obtained a competent oracle? But at Gibeon, even without any suggestion on his part, the priests might be trusted to seize the opportunity to wipe out their old score against Saul for his treatment of their people, the more so as such an act would be not only condoned but demanded by the religious mind of the age. It would be alike unfair and unworthy, however, to press this point. Gibeon was not far from Jerusalem, and it was, as we have seen, a sanctuary of high importance, honoured later by a visit from the great Solomon himself: and no special suspicion need attach to David from his choice of it on this occasion.

A faint suspicion, however, might be not quite illegitimate if the particular priest who administered the oracle was Abiathar. On other occasions in the Books of Samuel this priest was closely associated with David. After Saul's massacre of the priests, Abiathar flees to David, who requests him to remain with him, and guarantees his protection (1 Sam. xxii. 22 f.). Later he appears beside David "with an ephod"—the instrument for securing the oracle—"in his hand" (xxiii. 6); and on two recorded occasions—in reality, probably on far more—David is stated to have consulted him by means of the ephod (xxiii. 9, xxx. 7). The words of Solomon in 1 Kings ii. 26, when he is on the eve of deposing Abiathar in favour of Zadok, attest the long

and close intimacy of that priest with David. Now it has to be remembered that Abiathar was the only surviving priest of the massacre at Nob (or Gibeon ?) [1] instigated by Saul and carried out by Doeg (1 Sam. xxii. 20), and that he had therefore the motive of blood-revenge for the extermination of Saul's descendants. If, then, as is not improbable, Abiathar was the priest who administered the oracle at Gibeon, David may have cherished the hope, whether faint or confident, for an answer which would rid him, once and for all, of the chief remaining menace to his political security. It is not really necessary to suppose that the oracle was tampered with, as either Abiathar—if he was the priest—or in any case the Gibeonites, had satisfactory and adequate motives for interpreting the calamity as they did.

Still we cannot altogether deliver our minds from the impression that the answer of the oracle, pointing so unmistakably to the complete and final removal of every remaining member (except the lame Meribbaal) of his rival's family, agrees too ominously well with David's political necessities. It can hardly be denied that sinister possibilities are present; whether those possibilities are probabilities can only be decided after an impartial consideration of the character of David as a whole. Such an estimate is by no means easy, as of all Old Testament characters, his is surely one of the most varied and complex. This is not the place to attempt such an estimate, but one or two considerations may be pointed out.

When we remember the cruelty and the cunning which characterise Oriental courts, alike in ancient and modern times, we shall not too summarily dismiss the possibility of David's having taken steps to secure his throne by the

[1] The argument lends perhaps some slight confirmation to Cheyne's identification of Nob with Gibeon.

violent elimination of all who might contest it. The second chapter of 1 Kings throws a flood of lurid light upon the methods by which a new reign might be inaugurated. Solomon began by having his rival Adonijah put to death, and any others whom he considered dangerous, such as Joab, who had supported Adonijah, and Shimei, who had shown such bitter hostility to David during the rebellion of Absalom (2 Sam. xvi. 5 ff.). The story of these official assassinations concludes with grim simplicity: "and the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon" (1 Kings ii. 46); in other words, the foundations of his throne were bathed in blood. Now later generations held the memory of Solomon in hardly less honour than that of David, as the glorious founder of the Temple and the unique embodiment of wisdom: and if such methods could be deliberately adopted by such a man to secure his position and the story of them told without censure, it is still less to be wondered at if David who is first introduced to us as "a mighty man of valour and a man of war" (1 Sam. xvi. 18), a man who had "shed blood abundantly and made great wars, and shed much blood upon the earth" (1 Chron. xxii. 8), and whose position as monarch was in a sense even more precarious than that of Solomon, the hereditary principle not having been yet established—should have adopted equally summary methods to rid himself of his rivals. It is certain that suspicion very early centred upon David for complicity in the destruction of Saul's descendants. The story of Shimei's attitude to David during the rebellion of Absalom—a story which, though told earlier, is really later than the one we are considering—furnishes indubitable testimony on this point. Shimei, we read, "came out, and cursed still as he came, and he cast stones at David. And thus said Shimei when he cursed, 'Begone, begone, *thou man of blood*, and base fellow: Jehovah hath returned upon

thee all the blood of the house of Saul, in whose stead thou hast reigned ' " (2 Sam. xvi. 5–7). The significance of this fierce hostility lies in the fact that Shimei is " a man of the family of the house of Saul " ; and it is hardly possible to evade the conclusion that Shimei is alluding to the murder —albeit executed under the sanction of religion (2 Sam. xxi. 6, 9)—of the descendants of Saul, and that he holds David responsible for that murder. Shimei, at any rate, cherished no delusions as to the source from which the oracle was inspired. He may indeed have been wrong, but this early suspicion of the guilt of David cannot be lightly set aside.

On the other hand, it may be just as vigorously urged that David was a man of peculiarly chivalrous and magnanimous nature. (*a*) This is placed for ever beyond all question by his noble elegy over Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i.)—one of the most touching tributes that ever celebrated human worth. Chivalrous indeed must have been the soul of the man who sang so glowing and splendid a song in honour of the enemy who had hunted him over hill and dale and thirsted for his blood. (*b*) Further proof of David's magnanimity has also been found in the unhesitating readiness with which, against the advice of his friends, he spared the life of Saul when he had him at his mercy. The story is twice told (1 Sam. xxiv. and xxvi.), but here, as so often in the Pentateuch, we have almost certainly to do with two versions of the same incident. But whether the thing happened once or twice, the magnanimity of David is held to be proved. Against this, however, it has been urged that David's conduct may have been dictated, at least in part, by motives of policy. It is a curious and perhaps significant fact that twice in each story David emphasises the sanctity of " Jehovah's anointed." " Jehovah forbid that I should do this thing unto my lord, Jehovah's anointed, to put forth

my hand against him, seeing he is Jehovah's anointed. . . . I will not put forth my hand against my lord, for he is Jehovah's anointed" (xxiv. 6, 10). "David said to Abishai, 'Destroy him not; for who can put forth his hand against Jehovah's anointed and be guiltless? . . . Jehovah forbid that I should put forth my hand against Jehovah's anointed'" (xxvi. 9, 11). It may seem ungenerous to ascribe David's refusal to put Saul to death to any other motive than that of his native chivalry: but it is abstractly possible to suppose that so astute a man as David (1 Sam. xvi. 18), who may himself at this time have aspired to the throne, would have regarded the murder of the king as an ugly precedent to establish, and that it served his own purpose well to surround the person of the monarch with a halo of inviolable sacrosanctity. At any rate the magnanimity of this incident is not quite so indubitable as that of the elegy.

(*c*) Another proof of David's native magnanimity has been sought in his treatment of Meribbaal (Mephibosheth). "I will surely show thee kindness for Jonathan thy father's sake, and will restore thee all the land of Saul thy father" (2 Sam. ix. 7). This seems the willing tribute of a generous soul to the memory of his dead and dearly beloved friend. This very generosity, however, is manifestly streaked with suspicion and caution. Notice how significantly the story ends: "He did eat continually at the king's table; and he was lame in both his feet" (2 Sam. ix. 13). Each of these clauses has its peculiar point. The man whom David befriended was a cripple, "lame in both his feet," and therefore little likely to take any active part in fomenting rebellion; and even so, he kept him under continual surveillance, by conferring upon him the ambiguous honour of perpetual guest. Probably the suspicion which prompted these precautionary measures was not without justification,

for later Meribbaal is accused of taking Absalom's side during the rebellion, in the hope that the disturbance might end by restoring him to his grandfather's throne: "for he thought, To-day will the house of Israel restore me the kingdom of my father" (2 Sam. xvi. 1-4). True, this may only be a slander of his servant Ziba (2 Sam. xix. 25–30), as it may seem improbable that a cripple should aspire to the throne, especially at a time when the favourite was the fascinating Absalom. On the other hand, the accusation may point in the direction of the truth. In any case, David manifestly suspected him, and the magnanimity which assigned him a place at his table may not be so unadulterated as might at first sight appear.

If David was inspired by fear and jealousy of Saul's family to instigate the violent removal of all its members but one, and to keep that remaining member under perpetual guard, it would bring him curiously into line with Saul, who had been actuated by the very same motives in his relentless pursuit of David over the hills of Judah, and who had sought his life even earlier, when he was still at court. Each stood in the way of the other. David may have seen in Saul's surviving descendants, as Saul had seen in David (1 Sam. xviii. 8),[1] the fatal barrier to complete security upon the throne. But it cannot be absolutely proved that David had any complicity in the destruction of Saul's descendants or that he influenced the oracle which decreed their fate. Shimei's direct charge may be held to confirm the suspicion which, on other grounds, may be supposed to attach to the conduct of the oracle; but he, as a member of Saul's clan, may have been ready to suspect unjustly and without sufficient foundation. He may have sincerely regarded as true what he had only reason to regard as possible or probable. An admirer of David would be thoroughly justified in main-

[1] "What can he have more but the kingdom?" (cf. xx. 31).

taining that his appeal to the oracle was as ingenuous as, on a previous occasion, Saul's own appeal had been. After a battle with the Philistines, Saul, on consulting the oracle with a view to a further advance and receiving no answer, immediately infers that the Deity is angry in consequence of some sin or violation of taboo in his camp (1 Sam. xiv. 36-42), and he at once takes steps—again by means of the oracle, as the Septuagint text of verse 41 makes clear—to discover the offender. The significant words are: "As Jehovah liveth, who saveth Israel, *though it be in Jonathan my son*, he shall surely die" (*v.* 39; cf. *v.* 24). If Saul was willing to accept the decision of the oracle even against his own son, it is not perhaps too much to suppose that David went to the oracle—the natural oracle for him to consult, considering the proved prominence of Gibeon at that time—with an equally open mind, ready to accept its decision whatever it may be, and with no sordid ulterior political design.

The remaining verses of the story (7-14) create no special difficulty.

The foregoing discussion serves to show what an intricate matter true historical study is, and how impossible it sometimes is, with our lamentably meagre evidence, to reach indubitable conclusions on matters of even first-rate historical importance. The preacher may well feel embarrassed, after having done all this preliminary historical work, in dealing with a passage which raises so many unsolved and perhaps insoluble problems. His effort to pierce behind the narrative has only served to give him confusion where before all was, or seemed, simplicity; and his first impulse may be to run away. Or he may content himself by dwelling upon the complex motives that govern the actions of men, even of so royal a soul as David; or, in his treatment of the later part of the story, he may be both

historically instructive and religiously edifying by bringing out the savage quality of primitive religion, whose God could demand the execution of seven innocent men, tracing the gradual purification and enlargement of the idea of God, and contrasting the barbarities of the ancient Hebrew God with the loving Father revealed to us in Jesus Christ. All this would be helpful and far from irrelevant. But another way is to stand back from the passage, after having lived within it, and to look at the great ideas—primitive in form, but palpitating with life—that throbbed in the mind of the man who wrote it.

(i.) Of these the first is this—*the need of some interpretation of the world.* A famine occurs and persists: why? The ancient man's answer may not be ours, but it is much to have asked the question. The question can only be asked by one who believes that the world, that a famine, that everything, has a meaning. The pathos of life is that so few have the clue. We are like Pharaoh's butler and baker who with sorrowful faces say to Joseph, "We have dreamed a dream, and there is none that can interpret it" (Gen. xl. 7). The dream of life is hard to interpret: the design of the web of experience—alike of the world and of the individual—is hard to make out. And if the drift and meaning of normal experience is difficult enough to decipher, what of life's abnormal things—its famines, wars, losses, disasters, catastrophes? The deep heart does not accept these things without challenge. It asks why? because it believes in God and that there is in His universe, which would otherwise be intolerable, a purpose and a meaning. We do not always put it thus, but at bottom, that is our mind about it. The ancient man felt this as keenly as we. The priest to whom he took his perplexity may often have guided him in ways that were foolish and irrelevant enough, but the instinct was sound which led him to the man who was supposed to

know the mind of God. For the Christian, Jesus is the great Master-Interpreter, and experience can never again be a hopeless and baffling riddle to one who has the mind of Jesus. But the time for Him was not yet.

It is significant, too, that the interpretation offered by this story is a moral interpretation: the famine is explained by sin. Here the modern man is peculiarly, and to some extent justly, rebellious: he will have nothing to do with a doctrine which connects physical disaster with moral delinquency. Mr. Lecky remarks, in his *History of European Morals*, that "there arises in the minds of scientific men a conviction, amounting to absolute moral certainty, that the theological habit of interpreting the catastrophes of nature as Divine warnings or punishments or disciplines, is a base and pernicious superstition": and Mr. Edmund Gosse, in *Father and Son*, speaks of his father as retaining "the singular superstition, amazing in a man of scientific knowledge and long human experience, that all pains and ailments were directly sent by the Lord in chastisement for some definite fault, and not in relation to any physical cause." After all, this refusal to interpret disaster as necessarily and invariably chastisement, is not exclusively modern: it is as old as our Lord (Luke xiii. 1-5), as old as the Book of Job. Yet in spite of this there persists among thoughtful men the feeling that we are living in a moral universe, to which nothing that happens is unrelated. The answer of the oracle may conceivably have been crossed by base political motives, but it doubtless appealed to the conscience of the time, which instinctively connected disaster with wrong. Beneath this crude interpretation is hidden the permanent truth that the world of experience demands a moral interpretation.

(ii) Another great truth of the passage is that *the past lives on*. It cannot be escaped: it may be buried, but it

cannot die. Sooner or later it rises from its grave and looks us in the face—like Joseph, whom his brethren thought they had done with for ever, but who rises out of the buried years and faces them with the soul-searching words, "I am Joseph your brother whom ye sold into Egypt" (Gen. xlv. 4). Saul did not know when he was slaughtering the Gibeonites that he was sealing the doom of his own sons and grandsons as well. He had broken a treaty solemnly made by an earlier leader of Israel; and in a moral world such things cannot pass unpunished. Doubtless here again this great idea is presented in thoroughly primitive fashion, and worked out with a deliberate barbarity which was only possible to an age which treated the family, the clan, or the nation, as the moral unit—which had no real conception of the individual, and consequently of the enormity of making the innocent suffer for the guilty. But the truth behind this primitive practice is of permanent and overwhelming importance. The past is never over, it lives on. The horrors of the last few years have taught us how terrible a thing it is to break a treaty and that sooner or later the price must be paid to the uttermost farthing. A broken treaty may break the world in pieces.

(iii.) Last, there is *the wonder of mother-love*. "They were put to death in the days of harvest, in the first days, at the beginning of barley harvest. And Rizpah the daughter of Aiah took sackcloth, and spread it for her upon the rock, from the beginning of harvest until water was poured upon them from heaven; and she suffered neither the birds of the heavens to rest on them by day, nor the beasts of the field by night." Nothing can surpass the simple pathos of these words. For a corpse to remain unburied was, to the ancient mind, not only an indignity but a calamity, as the souls of the unburied dead were believed to wander restlessly about; but the horror of such a fate was inconceivably aggravated

if the corpse should suffer mutilation, as from a wild beast. The later and humaner law prescribed that even a murderer should be buried on the day of his execution (Deut. xxi. 22 f.). This mitigation of the criminal's fate was refused in the case of Saul's descendants, perhaps, as Gressmann suggests, because the sacrificial ritual in such cases demanded their exposure. However that may be, Rizpah covered herself with imperishable glory by the heroism of affection which kept her at her lonely guard for six long months beside the bodies of her beloved dead. Mother-love is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever, and the fierce men who told and listened to such tales knew that love as well as we; but it shines with all the more radiance here against the dark background of the vendetta. If a guilty man could, in the person of his innocent sons and grandsons, be pursued beyond the grave by the sincere but savage conscience of the time; if a priest of God could deliver an oracle which would inevitably send seven innocent men to their doom: if a trail of blood ran over the lives and the minds of Israel's leaders in those distant days: it is a comfort to remember that there was also then a woman whose love was stronger than death.

If I were hanged on the highest hill,
Mother o' mine, O mother o' mine!
I know whose love would follow me still,
Mother o' mine, O mother o' mine!

If I were drowned in the deepest sea,
Mother o' mine, O mother o' mine!
I know whose tears would come down to me.
Mother o' mine, O mother o' mine!

If I were damned of body and soul,
I know whose prayers would make me whole,
Mother o' mine, O mother o' mine!

John E. McFadyen.

THE PHILOLOGY OF ST. LUKE'S PREFACE.

A THOUGHTFUL and gifted Achaean, who had been brought with a thousand others as a kind of hostage to Rome somewhere about B.C. 200, watched with keen and awestruck gaze Rome's conquest of the world, and set himself to tell "in what way and by what kind of polity well-nigh all the inhabited world was overcome in barely fifty-three years and fell under the single dominion of the Romans, an event without precedent in history." "For Fortune brings in many innovations and is perpetually making the lives of men the arena for her strivings, but never yet, we may roundly assert, did she perform such a work, nor engage in such an effort, as that which our generation has witnessed" (Polyb. i. 4, 5). He felt that he and the men of his day were watching "an achievement at once the fairest and the most beneficent ever wrought by Fortune." It is, he says, of thrilling interest to note "the method which she adopted for bringing about this consummation of world-interests" (*πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὅλων πραγμάτων συντέλειαν*). They have before their eyes "a dénouement and consummation" (*καταστροφὴν καὶ συντέλειαν*, iii. 1, 9). "The growth and progress of Rome had reached its consummation" (*ἐτετελείωτο*, iii. 4, 2).

All and more than all that is uttered in these phrases of the Achaean is tersely expressed by the Antiochene physician in a single word. That which impels him and has impelled many to take up the pen is, he tells us, *τὰ πεπληροφορημένα ἐν ἡμῖν πράγματα*. We have every reason to assume that he chose this mode of expression deliberately and with his eyes open. Now the word that he has chosen (*πληροφορέω*) is like *εὐφορέω*, *καρποφορέω*, *τελεσφορέω* and a number of special verbs such as *ἐλαιο-*

φορέω, a *nature*-word, denoting the *full bearing* of soil or tree. Like other nature-words it was adopted into the language of finance, as "yield" and "fructify" and "mature" in English. It is often found in the Papyri in the Middle or Passive of money "coming in with full yield," or even of the lender "receiving a full yield" (of capital and interest). In the second Similitude of Hermas it is seen very distinctly as a *nature*-word. It is remarked that when a vine climbs up an elm, each can produce in the other a full fruitage, and then it is added οὕτω καὶ οἱ πένητες ἐντυγχάνοντες πρὸς τὸν κύριον ὑπὲρ τῶν πλουσίων πληροφοροῦσι τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν, καὶ πάλιν οἱ πλούσιοι χορηγοῦντες τοῖς πένησι τὰ δέοντα πληροφοροῦσι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν. The poor interceding to the Lord for the rich *bring their wealth to full development* (lit. "yield their wealth in full measure"). The rich by supplying the poor with what is needful *bring their souls* (i.e. the souls of the poor) *to full development* (lit. "yield their souls in full measure"). When St. Paul says to Timothy τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον (2 Tim. iv. 5), he is bidding him develop, unfold, bring to a head, put forth in full yield all the powers of his God-given office. And the scholar who induced the Westminster Company that dealt with the Epistles for the Authorised Version to banish "fulfil" to the margin and put "make full proof of" in the text was evidently anxious to mark the verb as a nature-word, and was familiar with such phrases as "the timeliest fruit often cometh to least proof" (Abp. Sandys, Sermon XV. c. 1575-1585). In the same chapter we read ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα πληροφορηθῇ· "that through me the proclamation may come to full-fruitage" (*v.* 17). Cp. Colossians i. 5 f., where the Gospel is said to be καρποφορούμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον. Very instructive is the contrast between the word as used by Ignatius the martyr-bishop of Antioch and Luke its

physician-evangelist. In the Letters of St. Ignatius we meet with πληροφορεῖσθαι or πεπληροφορῆσθαι applied to Christian men or Christian Churches *attaining to full-bearing* in the great things which Jesus Christ wrought, "in the Birth and Passion and Resurrection which came to pass in the time of the governorship of Pontius Pilate,—things wrought really and securely (πραχθέντα ἀληθῶς καὶ βεβαίως) by Jesus Christ our Hope; and may it befall no one of you to abandon that Hope" (Letter to the Magnesians, ch. xi.). St. Luke, on the other hand, writes in his Preface of the πράγματα "which have *come to full-bearing* in" Christians. Such Christians are described by the bishop as πεπληροφορημένους εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμων. (To the Church at Smyrna 1.)

When we have let the term, which St. Luke chose to express his thought in this most carefully-worded Preface, utter its fuller music, we turn again to compare him with Polybius. It is evident that the two writers have much in common. They have eyes to see the greatness of history and width of vision to see it whole. They are deeply conscious, with all their appreciation of human worth, that a Higher Power is carrying out a purpose in it. They both feel that within their own lifetime there has fallen an epoch in human history, and one marked by a conquest of the world, by a consummation towards which the ages have been moving. The centre to which Polybius sees the inhabited world made to turn is the imperial city whither the *doctor gentium* is in St. Luke's narrative divinely led. While Polybius shows how essential in his eyes was Rome's polity to Rome's triumph, it is in the Letter to the Church, with whose founding St. Luke is connected, that we meet with the words, "Only, as the Gospel of Christ demands of you, exercise citizenship, be public-spirited" (πολιτεύεσθε), and "Our citizenship is in heaven" (πολίτευμα.

See Philippians i. 27 and iii. 20); while St. Luke's is the only Gospel in which the word *πολίτης* occurs (xv. 15; xix. 14). But, largely as St. Luke's attitude toward the world-situation in his day is illustrated by that of Polybius in his day, the Achaean could hardly have used St. Luke's word. None of the *πράγματα* of which he writes could have been thought of by him as "coming to full proof," to fulness of issue and development, to perfection of fruit-bearing power. Only one who had witnessed the fruit-laden trees, who had known by experience the presence of "the time of fruit," could perhaps have so thought and so written. The virile race, whose contribution to the world is set forth with such keen appreciation by the Achaean hostage, had not even prepared the soil for the Tree of Life to be planted in. That honour was given to Israel. Rome had the humbler task of preparing and securing the highways of sea and land for the messengers of "the words of this Life," so that the Gospel could "bear fruit and increase in all the world." That One should come to make good the proclamation, "From Me is thy fruit found," to be the "True Vine" in whom believers can "bear much fruit," in whose Birth and Passion and Resurrection human wills and characters could attain their proper development, that the unfolding power of these facts would one day impel men to write of a far greater *συντέλεια τῶν ὅλων πραγμάτων* than he had witnessed – all this was beyond Polybius' ken.

We have tried to get a glimpse of St. Luke's motive for writing, first by comparing his preface with that of Polybius, and then by letting the word *πεπληροφορημένων* show us how the spectacle of Rome's newly won mastery of the world, which set the Achaean his task, fell short of that triumph of the Spirit of Christ which moved the man of Antioch to tell the story of its arrival.

We must now observe the terms in which St. Luke describes the task which he with many others had taken in hand. It is the more necessary that we should do this carefully, because so great a scholar as Blass has, I believe, read too hastily the passage which is our chief witness for the meaning of the all-important word.

The verb which St. Luke uses is a compound of a very common verb (*τάσσω*) "to range," "form up," "set in array." It is found in composition with a large number of prepositions, to express "forming up *in front*" or "*behind*" or "*alongside*" or "*opposite*" or "*changing* formation." The particular compound used by St. Luke would be the natural one to express the word of command "As you were" or "Re-form company." It is found in a treatise of Plutarch on the "Sagacity of Animals." Plutarch introduces the story he is going to tell by saying that, whereas many wonder at elephants going through performances that have been taught them involving a power of memory almost too great for a human being, he for his part sees intelligence discovering itself rather in their spontaneous and untaught feelings and movements, inasmuch as these are, so to speak, free from dilution and admixture of anything extraneous. "To make my meaning clear by an example," he continues, "it happened that in Rome not long ago several elephants were being got ready for a display, and were being taught to stand in sundry perilous positions (*προδιδασκομένων στάσεις τινὰς ἵστασθαι παραβόλους*) and to circle round and round in difficult whirling movements (*κινήσεις δυσεξελίκτους ἀνακυκλεῖν*). One of them, the greatest dunce of all, who got scolded and punished at every lesson, was seen several times by night quite on his own (*αὐτὸς ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ*) *resetting himself by the light of the moon in the positions* and practising the movements which he had been learning"

(*πρὸς τὴν σελήνην ἀναταττόμενος τὰ μαθήματα καὶ μελετῶν*, lit. "by the light of the moon *re-forming the things learned* and practising [them]." It will be observed (1) that Plutarch expressly dissociates himself from those who wonder at the *memory* shown by elephants, and tells the story to illustrate what seems to him a greater sign of intelligence, untaught *feelings* and *movements*, in this case shame and chagrin and the nightly tramp and self-imposed practice: (2) that he is drawing attention to something that was *seen*, not a mental process but a bit of physical drill: (3) that for what the beast did he needed *light*; he could not put himself in those hazardous positions with the added risk of stepping into unseen holes, or spin round with unseen boulders to tumble over; and lastly (4) that the almost synonymity of *ταρασσεσθαι* and *ἵστασθαι* shows that the words *ἀναταττεσθαι τὰ μαθήματα* refer back to and are meant to be made intelligible by *στάσεις τινὰς ἵστασθαι παραβόλους*. The poor beast was trying over and over again to find out how to keep his balance in the awkward positions prescribed. No doubt he was at the same time making a great effort of memory, but this he and all the troupe had to do in the circus, and the point of the story is avowedly not this.

So much for the verb. We must next mark its construction. The Greek for "they formed their ships in a circle" is *ἐτάξαντο κύκλον τῶν νεῶν*, lit. "they formed a circle of their ships" (Thucydides ii. 83. 4, cp. iii. 78, *κυκλον ταξαμένων*, "when they had formed a circle," i.e. "drawn themselves up in a circle"). So *ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων*, lit. "to re-form a narrative concerning the events," is equivalent to "to re-set the story of the events in a narrative," or "to re-form all that is known concerning the events in a narrative." The events took place in a beautiful order; one led up to another; they

formed a connected whole: they came to one head and issue. It is the historian's task to reproduce, not them but, their story as they took place.

In his Preface to his *History of England in the Seventeenth Century* von Ranke writes: "If any one has ever *attempted to reconstruct for himself a portion of the past* from materials of this kind," etc. (English Translation, Vol. I. p. xii.).

There is nothing in the *word* ἀνατάξασθαι to prevent our supposing that some, at all events, of the many to whom St. Luke refers may have undertaken to tell the story *viva voce*. But the facts that St. Luke wrote, and that συντάσσομαι is used of "composing," make it more probable perhaps that written narratives are in view. Such, then, was the Evangelist's aim: to reconstruct for himself and for Theophilus that wondrous portion of history, the story of those πράγματα, those things πραχθέντα ἀληθῶς καὶ βεβαίως ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, whose fruit was before their eyes—nay, was gladdening their hearts and renewing their lives. What had he done to equip himself for his task? Here again we shall turn with profit to Polybius, who uses in a very similar connexion the verb (παρακολουθεῖν) by which St. Luke describes what he had done. A man, he says, who would "see whole" the supremacy of Rome must trace the steps of its winning. "For I deemed it necessary for those who are to get such a comprehensive view as is requisite of the present supremacy of the Romans, which is the main point of our history, to trace step by step (παρακολουθῆσαι) how and when, after a signal disaster that befell their very fatherland, they began to advance to greater power; and, further, when and how, after making themselves masters of Italy, they essayed to aim at dominion abroad" (i. 12, 7). St. Luke justifies his claim to the attention of Theophilus by telling him that he has studied his subject in its full extent and in detail.

He no doubt felt that it would be impertinent to claim his attention otherwise. Every modest student conscious of having taken pains makes a like claim. There is no ground for thinking that he casts a slur on those who had written for different readers and with a less comprehensive aim. A Gospel written for the troops at Cæsarea may quite fitly have been on a different scale from the first volume of a History of the Church.

It is not improbable that both in *ἄνωθεν* and *ἀκριβῶς* St. Luke is referring to his very full account of the sending of John Baptist. Many examples could be given, especially from Isocrates, of a writer using *ἀκριβῶς* of his own *detailed* treatment of a matter in one place in contrast with his more summary dealing with it in another. There is nothing *inexact* in St. Mark's account of the Baptist's ministry, but when compared with St. Luke's it perfectly illustrates Isocrates' *συντομώτερον ἢ σαφέστερον* and *ἀκριβῶς μὲν οὐ διῆλθον* (Archidam. 24). St. Luke's *πᾶσιν* may refer to the Acts, his second volume.

Thus prepared, St. Luke tells Theophilus that his purpose was to write *καθεξῆς*, "by way of continuity." This was to be a special, perhaps the special feature, of his work. He would aim at showing the links between the stages of the mighty movement. So he gives us a vivid picture of the cradling of Christianity in Israel, of the group of devout "watchers for the morning" (Ps. cxxx. 6), true to Law and Temple, who "welcomed" the Infant Christ and in Him "Jerusalem's redemption" (Luke ii. 38). It is he who bridges for us the interval between the Infancy and Epiphany of our Lord, telling us of His obediently turning His back on the Temple instead of becoming, as He surely must have expected to become, the pupil of a Rabbi; and not leaving the carpenter's shop until "the word of the Lord came to John the son of Zacharias." It is St. Luke who

shows us in bold relief the Anointing with the Holy Spirit following upon the prayer and self-dedication at the Jordan. It is he who tells us that it was when representatives of the Chosen People were filled with madness and were discussing what to do with Him that Jesus, after a night of prayer, inaugurated the new order by appointing twelve princes of the Israel of God; and how His setting His face stedfastly to go up to Jerusalem followed upon a night of prayer in another mountain. The arresting phrase with which He reveals that from this point onwards the Lord is making His approach to Calvary and the Hill of the Ascension, *ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως αὐτοῦ* (ix. 51), when set beside the words of Acts ii. 1, *ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς*, suggests the question whether for St. Luke the *πράγματα* were not the *ἐπιφάνεια*, the *ἀνάλημψις* and the *ἔκχυσις* (*τοῦ πνεύματος*). But there is another question. Does not *καθεξῆς* point chiefly to the continuity of the seven weeks of the New Creation, culminating in the Advent of the Spirit, with the Passion and Resurrection? It was by that Advent that "the time of fruit" came, that *ἐπληροφορήθη τὰ πράγματα*, that men began to experience that which drove them *ἀναταξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων*.

One other "link" must not be passed over. Does St. Luke x. 38–42 connect Passion-tide with an Early Judaean ministry or with yearly sojourns at Bethany ever since the Lord's boyhood? The passage tells how one sister caught that set look on the Lord's face and *could* not go on with the preparations for supper, but sat at His feet and so learned the secret, unguessed even by the disciple whom Jesus loved, which prompted her to procure the spikenard with which to anoint Him beforehand for His burial.

St. Luke would have Theophilus recognise the "certainty," the "sober truth" (*ἀσφαλειαν*) of the words or accounts which had reached his ears (*περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων*). The older meaning of *κατηχεῖσθαι* is "to be informed." It afterwards came to be used of "receiving (formal) instruction." The question is in which sense St. Luke meant it. There is no ground for supposing that formal instruction was imparted by Christians in such a way as to leave those who received it in doubt of its *ἀσφάλεια*. In Acts xxi. 21 and 24 *κατηχεῖσθαι* means "to have reports dinned into one's ears": in xviii. 25 it may well refer not to some strangely inadequate instruction given to Apollos but to his having heard from many on their return from a visit to Jerusalem of the Ministry of the Baptist and the Epiphany of Jesus at the Jordan and in Galilee. *κατήχησις* is used by Diogenes Laertius (vii. 89) and Galen (*De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis*, p. 290, 33) of the *talk* to which children and others constantly listen "hearing Olympic victory and the having statues set up to one extolled and pronounced blessed by most men as good things, and defeat and disgrace as evil things." Such instances as these of the familiar force of the word would suggest that Theophilus may have been a Thessalonian Politarch who had had to listen to accounts of the turning of the world upside down. But it may be that he had sat among the *κατηχούμενοι* or "audientes" listening to exhortations and desired a more connected and precise statement of the great facts of the Christian Faith.

If we have rightly understood the crucial word in the Preface, it will be obvious that its dominating thought is closely akin to that of St. John's Prologue. That which stirs each Evangelist is the experience of a great arrival. St. Luke feels that he is living in "the time of fruit": St. John that "grace and truth became (or 'arrived') through

Jesus Christ," and that "out of His fulness," of grace and truth, he and his fellow-believers "have all received." He declares that the Law was God's gift through Moses, Law which is but precept and figure: whereas through Jesus Christ there has come, in the place of precept power to obey, and in the place of figure truth, reality, substance. When St. John says "We beheld His glory," he at least does not exclude that fruit of His coming borne in those of whom he said, δεδοξασμαι ἐν αὐτοῖς.

G. H. Whitaker.

RELATIVITY AND THE DEITY OF JESUS CHRIST.

The principle of Relativity, which has made the name Einstein famous throughout the scientific world, gives us a new and more comprehensive view of the material Universe: new, that is, in relation to the development of scientific thought. The revision we have to make in our conception of nature has been described as a revolution, comparable with that of the sixteenth century, when Copernicus told the world that the earth went round the sun. Before that time it was believed that the earth was the fixed centre of the Universe, and that the sun, moon and stars moved round it.

The accumulating knowledge of the past century, based as it is upon experimental research, has brought us to the point of knowing that we do not know. Whether the pre-Copernican or the post-Copernican is the correct conclusion now depends upon the observer and his choice of basis of reference. Every observation of the kind under notice must be qualified. That is to say, relatively to the earth, the sun rises and sets: relatively to the sun as a hypothetical fixed point, the earth revolves round it as a centre. This qualification is necessary because in the multitude of moving bodies which constitute the visible Universe, there is not one which is known to be absolutely at rest, by means of which the motion of all others can be defined.

Another interesting phase of the present situation is the change of view respecting the behaviour of light rays. Although it was well known that light travels with a uniform velocity, yet all the necessary allowances had not been made for this in formulating the laws of motion. In a more or less sub-conscious manner it has been assumed that that velo

city is infinite. Consequently erroneous conclusions had been come to. Events taking place at different distances appear to take place simultaneously according to common observation; but this can only be so if the velocity of light is infinite. If calculations are made allowing for the known definite velocity of light, these events are consecutive and not simultaneous.

Again, since light travels with a finite velocity, it has hitherto been surmised that an observer moving towards a source of light will conclude that the velocity will be greater for himself than it will be for another observer moving away from it. That it is necessary to add the velocities in one case and subtract them in the other appears to be self-evident. It is now recognised, however, that this is not the case. The velocity of light is constant for all observers, in whatsoever direction or with whatsoever velocity they are moving.

Light is propagated rectilinearly with one constant and finite velocity for all observers. The surprising fact is that a finite velocity can be constant irrespective of the velocity of moving observers. The conclusion has, however, been verified by most carefully devised experiments. It lies at the basis of the new conception and has far-reaching consequences.

The velocity of light being finite, it follows that no two observers separated from one another and moving at different rates will see, say, a flash of lightning at the same instant of time. More elaborate experiments based on this phenomenon prove that nó two observers moving at different velocities to one another will form the same estimate of the duration of the same interval of time. Neither will their measure of the same distance between the same two points be in agreement. Thus the constant quantity in nature is the velocity of light; distance and duration are variable.

The constant is the same irrespective of the velocity of the observer, the variables differ with the velocity of every individual observer.

These conclusions are now generally recognised to be true, not only because they are experimentally verifiable, but because their recognition and introduction into the laws of nature has enabled those laws to be stated in terms more generally and strictly accurate than has hitherto been the case. The relation between the velocity of the observer and the constant velocity of light has become a vital factor in the mathematical statement of those laws. And not until this is fully recognised can the laws of nature be regarded as universally true. At the same time, when this relation is given its rightful place in those calculations, the following demonstration is fully established.

Although every observer will have his own peculiar standards of measurement, differing from all others according to his individual velocity, yet the laws connecting those measurements will be universally true for every observer, whatever his velocity. It follows from this, that the universe of unending change is governed by unchanging laws.

A further consequence of the fact that distances and times vary with each individual observer is that time is not a thing in itself, absolute, invariable, and independent of circumstances and events, as we are accustomed to think it to be. It is merely a dimension connecting events in the same sense that distance connects places or points. This is difficult to realise, but an illustration will help to make it clearer.

Imagine an observer stationed upon the earth and moving with it in a certain direction through space; this direction becomes his time dimension, along which he is moving forward into space. Suppose another observer on a star moving from a point vertically overhead downwards to

wards the earth; this observer's time measurer will be a height or distance only to the one on the earth. Thus the new outlook has altered our conception of time entirely. Not only are we compelled to consider time as a variable dimension depending upon the *velocity* of the specified observer, but we have to recognise that it also varies with the *direction* in which the observer is moving. The recognition of this prepares the way for the broader and more comprehensive picture of the events taking place in the universe.

This alteration in our idea of time blends the dimensions of distance and duration, of space and time in one conception, now termed the "space time continuum."

In order to see the significance of this more clearly, imagine an observer standing at the end of a long stretch of straight road, who is watching a horse and rider galloping towards him. At first they are separated by a mile, but in six minutes the rider has reached the point where the observer is standing. The two dimensions, a space of one mile and a time of six minutes do not exist apart. The motion of the horse along the road makes the time, a clock can only measure it.

Further reflection on this identity of space and time leads to another important conclusion. In the same sense that the distance between the horse and the observer exists always in the present, the time is also "present." That is to say, the moment of arrival at the end of the mile, to the rider was a future event reckoned from the start, according to our usual conceptions. But to the observer, the whole time from start to finish was as really present as the ground along which the distance was measured. As, moreover, from the rider's point of view, part of the time occupied in the journey was past and part future (the past increasing and the future decreasing), to the observer past

and future were both present. Thus past and future are one and both exist in the present. If it were otherwise, the universe would need to be re-created every moment.

This argument may be taken to greater lengths. The Solar system is rapidly moving through space in a direction which we may describe as from east to west. From the commencement of its journey at a point among the "fixed" stars in the eastern end of the heavens to the end of its long journey amongst the stars at the western extremity, is a dimension of space which can be visualised in the present. The time distance corresponding to this embraces the whole past and future history of the system, and is equally in the present to an observer who can embrace the system adequately in one concept.

To such an observer, whom we may call "X," all time will be but a momentary experience. If his place of observation is at the commencement of the journey he will see all time as present. He will see the end from the beginning. A thousand years will be as one day. If the point of observation is in what *we* call the present, he will comprehend all the past and future history of our system in one single glance. At whatever point of time the observation is made all time will be present. Such an one will embrace the beginning, end, and midst of time in the present tense and will fittingly say, "*I AM* the beginning and the ending."

Minkowski seems to have been conscious of a discovery when he said, "Henceforth space and time in themselves vanish to shadows and only a kind of union of the two preserve an independent existence," whereas the principle is inherent in the statements just quoted, which have been on record from two to three thousand years.

Professor Carr has given an illustration of the universe which confirms the view that past and future really exist now.

"On a frosty morning we may see the watery vapour in the air we breathe condense into a small cloud and then rapidly disappear, reabsorbed in the atmosphere. Now let us suppose that we are suddenly reduced in all our proportions till we are some billionths smaller as seen by an independent observer. The general principle of relativity tells us that the change we should have undergone could not possibly appear to us as a change in ourselves, for all our velocities would remain constant: the change would therefore be wholly in space and time. The little globules of water would now be stars and planets at immense distances from one another, undergoing a slow age-long evolution and obeying the law of the inverse square."

Looking at this conception from the opposite point of view, and supposing ourselves enlarged so that we may look upon the whole universe as a cloud of vapour, each planet and star would be a molecule being rapidly reabsorbed into the space-time continuum. It would come into being and pass away in the present. The beginning and ending would both be now. This is the form in which the universe would present itself to such an observer as we have postulated above.

The principle of relativity suggests additional information concerning this observer "X." If we are to credit the reasoning of Leibnitz that because a thing is possible, it necessarily exists, then this observer not only exists but his reality is also demonstrated as a mathematical certainty. The reason why it is possible to conceive that the past and future are ever present to such an observer seems to be that our time estimates depend upon velocities. Where velocity approaches that of light, time depreciates to zero, that is to say it vanishes. In the words of Professor Eddington, "To a man travelling through space at the velocity of light and returning to the earth, a journey reckoned in years on

the earth would appear as an instant." Thus the characteristic velocity of the observer "X" is comparable with that of light. If in addition to saying "*I AM* the beginning and the ending," he were to say "*I AM* the Light," his words would be capable of mathematical demonstration.

Further, Professor Cunningham has expressed the view that "Real bodies become illusory in observation if they are conceived to be moving faster than light, the electrical constitution of matter seems to indicate that a body would suffer dissolution if it were accelerated so that its velocity was greater than light." That is to say, observer "X" must evidently be a discarnate personality. Such a being must have personality, or observation would be impossible. Consequently "X" must evidently be an intense personality, radiant yet unobservable, a living, yet immaterial reality. Finally we may say with a large measure of truth that the essence of the distinction between men and angels, between human and superhuman, between incarnation and discarnation, is mathematically demonstrated to be bound up in the question of velocities.

This larger view which is able to embrace the past and future of *time* in one concept, is no doubt made possible by an enhanced power of perception. Such a view is, as we see, within the capacity of the human mind. It may therefore reasonably be supposed that discarnate personalities or spirits have an even higher degree of perception, by means of which past and future *events* would be embraced within their range of vision. While, therefore, the Principle of Relativity is primarily concerned with the problem of physical nature and the material universe in general, it brings us ultimately to the consideration of some of the most profound philosophic and religious conceptions.

This higher degree of perception may therefore be described as a logical extension of the Principle of Relativity

into the realm of higher psychology. The human mind has powers and qualities far greater than is generally realised. Leibnitz did not fail to recognise those powers; but if his views did not receive the attention they deserved, because of their almost incomprehensible nature, they have now been very substantially verified. And this confirmation derives its origin from experimental research. His power of reason and insight have rarely been surpassed. The present perceptions, he said, are past perceptions grown more distinct. And again, the present perceptions of the mind are forecasts or prophecies of the future, since all its future perceptions are confusedly wrapped up in its present state. Thus he who sees all might read in each what is happening everywhere, and even what has happened, and shall happen, observing in the present that which is far off as well in time as in place.

The present position of advanced scientific thought has all the appearance of an approach to finality. This verdict of the greatest minds of this great age of learning is a corroboration of the most profound words of Scripture. The Deity of Jesus Christ has been unconsciously established. "Before Abraham was I am," and "Lo! I am with you always even unto the end of the ages," are the unpremeditated observations of One who embraces all events in time and space in His ever present and eternal self. They are the perfectly natural statements of One who is omniscient and omnipresent—very God.

In striking contrast to the spontaneity of these observations of Christ is the long spasmodic progress of human thought whereby the truth of His words has been verified. The greatest intellects of more than twenty centuries have been engaged in this pursuit. The names of Democritus, Plato, Descartes, Newton, Leibnitz and Einstein stand out in the great succession.

Great as are the fruits of the ancient philosophy, corrected by more recent experimental research, they but serve to emphasise the humanity of men whose names command unqualified praise, and the Deity of Him, who, while "despised and rejected of men," is Lord of all.

A. T. Swaine.

PRAYER AND PERSONALITY.

Most of the theoretical difficulties that arise in the treatment of prayer are the outcome of the tendency to regard it as a force rather than a function of personality. Many excellent definitions and illuminative descriptions place prayer amongst the forces of the universe, immaterial, it may be, but more or less detached from personality or as psychic phenomena. As such it is brought into relation with other forces of the cosmos, and is subject to the laws and uniformities by which all phenomena are governed. The main difficulty, therefore, occurs in the effort to reconcile its operations with the ascertained laws of the universe.

We cannot, of course, deny that prayer is a power, but its whole validity depends upon its being a personal approach to God as a Person, and its answer as a personal response. If we regard personality as the highest category of thought and if we accept our Lord's final revelation of God as the Father, the question does not arise as to whether prayer can alter, supersede or conflict with material forces or the uniformity of nature; it belongs to another category altogether. It is an appeal or an advance to God on the part of His children with reference to matters of interest and concern to them. The answer in the form of a response to a personal appeal can never be set aside by any material limitations or the known order of the universe, where the

infinite personality is concerned. The greater must include the less and transcendent personality cannot be over-ridden by its own laws and processes.

The danger of regarding prayer as a mere agency or power or as the release of certain forces is that people become discouraged and "scrap the machine" if they find that it does not work as they feel justified in supposing it should, and when for so much expenditure of energy no commensurate results follow. As a force, prayer should be subject to a calculus, and we should be justified in expecting quantitative results to ensue from its exercise when all the conditions are fulfilled.

Our Lord has quite rightly been held up as the supreme authority on this subject, and His whole life was the exemplification of the practice of prayer. The characteristic feature of His teaching is that it is so wonderfully simple that it is brought within the capacity of any child to follow. In fact it is the child who "asks" for things when he is conscious of his need. To "seek" comes within the scope of the child's games all the world over in some form of "Hide and seek," in which a hidden person has to be found. In the endeavour to effect an entry to the house where personal friendships may be set up and the freedom of the home may be realised, even a child can "knock." Each of these acts involve a personal approach and an appeal. The value of the child-like spirit in prayer thus becomes immediately manifest. It is sometimes said that prayer is an attitude of the soul, but it is more correct to represent faith as the soul's attitude towards the Supreme Reality, which, of course, is included in the conception of prayer, but prayer emerges when there is an advance or an appeal to God as a person.

Prayer regarded as a personal approach and appeal is inclusive of desire for a personal favour or gift, for fellow-

ship and acceptance, for self-expansion and service. It thus embraces all forms of petition, of self expression as well as of communion. But even in petition prayer is not such in its true sense, if it is merely a means of obtaining things, still less as a last resort when other means have failed or as an easy method of securing anything we want. The gift we receive in answer to prayer is not the thing in itself or for its own sake merely, it comes bearing the stamp of the Divine blessing. It is God's gift and it is good because it is His bestowal. Otherwise prayer would be a mere instrument for getting things that we cannot so well secure in any other way. The conception of prayer as a force placed at our disposal or originated by ourselves would reduce it to the level of the psychical, denuded of its ethical value and spiritual significance.

In all petition we approach God with reference to a particular object of desire. It is a familiar phrase to say, "I approached him on the matter." But desire, or even *libido*, according to psychological analysis always conceives its object *sub specie boni*. Thus it is doubtful if desire could ever be really satisfied in answer to prayer without the blessing of Him whose personal favour imparts a distinctive value to the gift. Even if we could obtain all we want without prayer, prayer would still be necessary in order that the soul's capacity for the presence of God might be met, and desire for self expansion in the possession of things should be fulfilled by the realisation of self in the acquisition of a good. As persons we can only be satisfied in the personality of a present God and by intercourse with Him. Hence the importance of communion. Desire being an integral part of prayer, it is doubtful, however, if petition is ever quite in abeyance. It may not be definitely framed or centred upon specific objects as outside the scope of the Divine activity, but the constant and unceasing

appeal to Him may form the dominant feature or the undertone of our conscious life. During the waking day there may be small opportunity to shape definite petitions, but the conception of God as filling up the background of our consciousness, with the sense that there is One whom we desire and seek who is always present, looking on with all the sweet interest of love, will render it possible for us to "pray without ceasing." Every impulse, thought and act may be performed as in the light of His countenance, and thus constitute a continuous appeal to Him for His support and approval. Perhaps even subconsciously we may feel that at any moment we have only to look up to find Him there. Prayer becomes a far more important factor in self-expression and self-realisation when all the mysterious powers of personality are taken into consideration.

It follows then from this position that if prayer is a personal approach and appeal, the answer would be a personal response. The gaining of mere things, however directly or wonderfully they may come, is not the answer to prayer. It is the given assurance that the Person to whom we pray meets us and satisfies us by His "attention" to our requests and by taking us and all our interests within the scope of His operation. He gives us the satisfaction we want whether the things asked for are forthcoming or not. The reply on the telephone is not "the delivery of the goods," however glad we may be to receive them, but the answering consciousness at the other end. If we really knew our own hearts we should understand that the resultant satisfaction in answer to our prayers is the assurance that all our affairs are in God's hands and the confidence that all that Divine wisdom and love can do will be done. The reason for this is that personal needs can only be met by a personal response. In the ultimate we believe that it

consists in the consciousness of God's own self-giving in Christ Himself.

There are two manifest advantages, we believe, in viewing the subject in the light of personality. The first is that by this means the difficulty of "unanswered prayers" is largely met. Whatever things are wrought by prayer, "more than this world dreams of," and even when the things we ask for are not granted, there is always in true prayer the assurance that our requests have touched the heart of God, the "breath that fleets beyond this iron world and touches Him who made it." Speaking in terms of personality, we say that our needs are brought before His notice and have received His attention. That at least can never be futile or unmeaning, nor need we ever doubt that the answer is given. True prayer is then always answered because it is a personal response to our overtures. Such a response can never fail to be the best possible answer. The somewhat perplexing, though exceedingly beautiful promise in Isaiah (lxv. 24) can thus be clearly understood: "And it shall come to pass that, before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear." The immediacy of the answer consists in the personal response; indeed He is there, as it were, before us, ready to receive us.

Then, too, a more serious difficulty, involving a danger, is averted by this explanation. There has been a tendency of late years not only to conventionalise our conceptions of this holy exercise, but also to fall into subjectivism. Our habit of regarding prayer as a force leads us to suppose that we exert the force, or at least control it, by our acts of devotion. We often hear quite good people say, "I believe in prayer: it is a mighty spiritual force." The retort that springs to one's lips is, "I do not believe in prayer, but in the God who answers prayer." We may, as it were, touch

the button that releases the power, but we neither provide the power nor do we originate it. We can never be too often reminded that the answer to prayer is distinctively God's action, and that it is essentially objective. The view that both prayer and its answer are personal brings in necessarily the subjective and the objective elements. Unless there is an objective personality, One who is "touched with the feeling of our infirmities," there is no answer at all, whatever the reflex action may be. Without faith in the personal objective the fount of prayer would soon dry up at the spring. It is often asserted that the best use of prayer is that we may be placed in the right mental attitude to answer our own prayers, and the reflex influence upon our consciousness and character will be such as to enable us to secure for ourselves the blessings that we crave. Indeed the tendency of late years is to eliminate the petitional element and to resolve prayer into meditation or mere subjective states of devotion, under the impression that this is the true attitude of mysticism. The greater mystics, however, have never lost sight of the objective, even when their thought has tended to blend subject and object into one. In the ultimate it will be found that prayer always requires for its answer and even for its continuous practice the assurance of an answering consciousness that is affected by our appeal and meets our approach. Valuable as the atmosphere of prayer may be and blessed in its reflex influence, it is God Himself whom we really want to satisfy us, as the analysis of desire reveals, and whatever we may gain by the prayer-habit, it "misses fire" unless its objective is beyond our own states of consciousness and unless we are convinced that God as a person has given to us and our requests what we are bound to term, for want of more adequate language, His attention and interest.

Intercessory prayer is complicated by reason of a third

person being involved, but it lends itself to similar treatment in so far as the suppliant identifies himself with the person for whom he pleads and makes common cause with that person. Undoubtedly many subconscious elements enter into the process and the person for whom intercession is made often becomes subject to telepathic and other psychic influences by the act of concentration of thought and feeling on the part of the intercessor. This influence may, of course, be sanctioned and sanctified by the divine blessing: all the same we do not regard any such psychic influences as being equivalent to prayer, nor as accounting for its chief or distinctive value. It is God who brings His grace and love to bear upon the souls for whom we pray and permits His interest to be engaged on behalf of those in whom we are interested.

Here we touch upon what may seem to be a profound mystery. Can we say that without our interest the Divine interest would be less? And is it possible that there are those, probably very many, who are at a disadvantage because no human friend can be found to intercede for them? The same question might be put with regard to all blessings that are mediated through human agency. We can but reply that our intercessions have been anticipated and that God has given us the impulse to pray for others, and by the force of circumstances and by His Spirit has suggested the reasons that should bring us to our knees for the sake of those whom He has determined to bless. More than we are perhaps aware, more than we can fully realise, the choicest gifts of His love come to men through human persons, and thus it obtains throughout our whole lives.

It has been truly said that all intercession is vicarious, and those who are most famous in the classic records of Scripture for their power of intercession are those who have

been willing to sacrifice themselves to the fullest extent for the sake of those for whom they intercede. We recall at once Abraham, Moses and Elijah, Jeremiah and other prophets, all of whom were prepared to surrender that which was dearest to them and life itself for the people of God, and after our Lord Himself stands Paul, who could wish himself accursed from Christ if only Israel might be saved. That God should bless another "for my sake" is not valid by way of intercession until I am prepared to sacrifice myself for the sake of him on whose behalf I intercede. In that case the identity of interest is complete and genuine, his burden becomes my burden, his cause is my cause, so effectually do I thus, as an intercessor, concern myself with his well-being, and God's blessing for him as the specific blessing that I have taken upon myself to ask on his behalf. The early Christian practice of the lateral extension of the arms, as indicated in *Acta Theclae* and the *Odes of Solomon*, and its survival in the ceremonial of the Mass, at least suggests this idea of self-sacrifice in prayer in the spirit of the cross of Christ.[1]

Again we assert that the answer to prayer is the immediate response to the heart of the intercessor that the Lord has taken the whole matter affecting the good of our friends within the scope of His interest and care, and of His effective activity. The manner or the form of the blessing that we desiderate for others we may well leave, as in the case of ourselves, to His infinite wisdom and love. The answer, at any rate to the intercessor, is fully assured. And it is as much as we can ever truly wish, and rightly considered it will meet our deepest desire that the interests and the well-being of our friends should be handed over to Him who possesses our confidence and love, and whose wisdom and love so utterly transcend ours.

[1] *Vide* "A Forgotten Conception of Prayer," Vacher Burch, EXPOSITOR, July, 1918, pp. 425-436.

In the last resort, prayer is a personal act or process of self-expression directed towards God, and its reply is a personal act of self-giving on the part of God. In its perfection it is, on our part, self-giving in desire and finally in will. The response is the outgoing of Divine love and in the ultimate the gift of Himself in Christ. For these reasons we pray in faith and both prayer and its answer are in Christ's name and in all that the name stands for within the realm of personality, human and Divine.

J. G. JAMES.

WHY "ACCORDING TO MATTHEW"? [1]

1. *Origin and Date of the Title.*

IT will generally be granted that the titles *κατὰ Μαθθαῖον, κατὰ Μᾶρκον, κατὰ Λοῦκαν, κατα Ἰωάννην*, by which the scribes of our oldest four-gospel texts mark off the different 'aspects' (*species*), as Irenaeus calls them, of the fourfold gospel, do not belong to the original compositions. These are survivals from a secondary stage of gospel transmission. "According to" (*κατά*) is not the preposition an author would prefix to his own name. Probably an earlier, if not the primary stage, was that in which a single, individual Gospel circulated anonymously as "the Gospel" in the particular region of its origin. This would be true even if, with Dr. Harris of Manchester, we posit a still earlier stage in which the individual Gospel bore a title of its own, such as *Ἀπομνημονεύματα τοῦ Κυριου*, superscribed by its author.

Ancient tradition credibly names Rome as the birthplace of Mark, the oldest of the four, and Ephesus as that of

[1] Paper read before the Oxford Society of Historical Theology March 1, 1920.

John, the latest. It is equally explicit as to the derivation of Matthew from Palestine, and it cites two early witnesses (Eusebius and the Latin Prologues) for "Antioch," or "Syria," as the home-land of the third evangelist, the writer early identified as "Luke," who is also the author of Acts. My own judgment of the internal evidence finds in each case strong corroboration of these traditions of provenance, credible in themselves because they only attempt to tell matters open to public knowledge.

But the special provenance of particular gospels is at present immaterial. The point to be observed is that there is an element of truth in Irenaeus' quaint association of the four Gospels with the four corners of the earth. Each compilation was at the first simply "the" Gospel (*τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*) for its own region. It was the gospel, the whole gospel, and nothing but the gospel. It was not looked upon as subject to copyright by any individual, but represented the general body of evangelic tradition available in the region. This body of tradition was at first oral, later it was codified in written form under more or less authoritative supervision, but not as the special composition of any one man. Hence its narrative was in the third person and appeared anonymously.

In its later, more literary development such a gospel might have a preface, referring by name to some Christian Maecenas such as Theophilus, and it is no small corroboration of the tradition quoted by Eusebius, and the reference of the Latin Prologue to "Lukas, Syrus natione" to find the *Clementine Homilies* independently referring to "Theophilus" as a patron of the primitive Church in Antioch. Luke's preface is a clear indication of the growing need for authentication. In the latest times of all we find covering letters such as the Epistles of the Spirit to the Churches, accompanying Revelation, or the letters addressed

to Gaius and other friends and supporters of the author of the Fourth Gospel. Finally the gospel may be supplemented by an appendix certifying that its witness is true and even that it is derived from an eye-witness of the events. But all this comes from the growing demand for authentication. *Early* gospels do not speak in the first person, nor mention any name in connexion with their authorship. That belongs to the pseudepigraphic gospels of the second century. The *early* gospels appeared anonymously, because they were compilations more or less authoritative of the accepted παραθήκη, the ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι used in the Church's κατηχήσις, the local παράδοσις of evangelic story.

We have surviving evidences of this one-gospel period in the usage of Basilides and Marcion *ca.* 130–140 A.D. Basilides came from Antioch. Kerdon, the teacher of Marcion, came from the same city. Both use Luke alone.[1] Both speak of it simply as "the gospel" (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον). Nor is this the case for the heretics only. Didaché and Justin both refer to passages found in Matthew alone as "written in 'the' Gospel." Papias uses two gospels, Justin three. Lastly, Irenaeus denounces those who use either more or less than four.

It is a second stage, intermediate between the use of single Gospels and of the "sacred quaternion" of Irenaeus and Tertullian, that introduces distinctive titles. The reason is obvious. Gospels current in the greater Christian centres, Rome, Antioch, Caesarea (Jerusalem seems to have clung to oral tradition), and Ephesus, spread beyond their native habitat and came into parallel use, if not into rivalry with one another. They thus required distinctive

[1] The burden of proof lies upon those who dispute this in the case of Basilides, alleging very flimsy evidence for his employment also of John. See Windisch in *Z.N.W.*

designations. So Papias of Hierapolis, who like all his contemporaries makes Matthew, the Palestinian, "apostolic" gospel, his standard, introduces quite a long defence, based on the testimony of a certain authoritative 'Elder' for his employment also of Mark for "some things" (ἔνια) and without dependence on its "order." His successor in the see of Hierapolis, Apollinarios, writes a commentary on Matthew not far from the time when a great controversy breaks out at Laodicea, only three miles away across the Lycus, as to whether the Lord's Supper is to be observed after the plan of "all Asia," and of the Fourth Gospel, i.e., on the 14th Nisan, or (as they expressly say) as required by "Matthew," i.e. on the 15th Nisan. Here seems to be distinct evidence from about the year 165–167 of the incoming of a gospel relatively new to the region, but regarded as of apostolic authority. It naturally produces disturbance by its conflict with local (Quartodeciman) usage, and probably also with the local Gospel, the Ephesian or Fourth Gospel, later attributed to "John." The process is reversed when, twenty years later, conservatives at Rome, such as Gaius, resist the introduction by the Asiatic Priscus, the disciple of Montanus, of the Ephesian Gospel. Gaius and his party naturally point to the conflict of John with Matthew, Mark, and Luke. They therefore attribute it to Cerinthus, the Jewish heretic. Traces of similar rivalry appear in Egypt also, where an indigenous compilation received the designation *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, apparently to distinguish it from one imported from Palestine which is dubbed the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. No one, of course, will contend that these are names of authors.

As to the date when the designations "According to Mark," "Luke," "Matthew," "John," became attached to the leading gospels early testimony is naturally meagre.

Mark, we know to have borne this title from the date of "the Elder" quoted by Papias. If this "Elder" be, as I have argued elsewhere, John of Jerusalem, whose death is dated by Epiphanius in 117–118 A.D., the date is so early as to give the title very great importance. On the other hand, the earliest mention of the name of the Apostle John as author of the Fourth Gospel is by Theophilus of Antioch, the contemporary of Irenaeus. Between these two dates, 115 and 185 A.D., must fall the titles which designate "Luke" and "Matthew" as evangelists. For Papias and Justin clearly regard Matthew as written by the Apostle of that name, as do all their contemporaries. As I have said, they quote it as "the" gospel, and scarcely refer to any other, except where Matthew is not available. The mere number and amount of the quotations from Matthew in Justin's period and down to the circulation of the *Diatessaron* of his disciple Tatian, as compared with those from all other gospels put together, would show how completely Matthew had achieved the authority and circulation we should expect from the only evangelic record commonly received as directly from the hand of an Apostle. But the achievement seems to be recent. There is no certain trace of Matthew in Clement of Rome or Hermas. Ignatius uses it, but makes strange alterations in its story of Jesus' birth, and employs in preference the *Διδασκαλία Πετρου* to prove the physical nature of the resurrection. As to Luke, Justin's claim for the Gospels as derived from "Apostles and companions of Apostles," while it does not carry us beyond Matthew and Peter as representing the "Apostles," manifestly includes Luke along with Mark as one of the "companions of Apostles."

Thus, so far as we can trace the history of the titles, the dates when they become current stand in the order we should expect. Gospels which claimed no higher authority

than that of a "companion of Apostles" would hardly have attained wide currency had others been already in the field purporting to be from the Apostles themselves. Mark, the oldest of all, is also the most unpretentious. Next to it comes Luke, which had put forward the name of Theophilus. Next appears Matthew, rapidly eclipsing the one-time predominance of Mark. Last of all, with claims far eclipsing those that went before, comes "John." It is not more used by Justin than apocrypha such as the *Acts of Pilate*. It is disputed by Gaius as respects authenticity; but with Tatian, Irenaeus and Hippolytus it achieves an authority equal, if not superior, to that of any of its predecessors.

2. *Internal Evidence refutes the Tradition of Matthean Authorship.*

In spite of the wide-spread and undisputed tradition of the second century, which from Papias downward declares our first Gospel the direct handiwork of the Apostle Matthew, modern criticism is unanimous in declaring it irreconcilable with the contents. The tradition alleges that the Apostle wrote in "Hebrew" (Aramaic), just as it assumes that Peter taught in "Hebrew" and required an "interpreter" (ἑρμηνεύς, Basilides; ἑρμηνευτής, Papias). The transliterated Aramaic utterances of Jesus (taken over from Mark) in the Gospels would have convinced the Greek-speaking Church, even apart from their knowledge of conditions in Palestine, and their possible recognition of the idioms of "translation Greek," that the language of Jesus and the Twelve was Semitic. Hence to reason closely from the Greek gospels required some support besides the *ipsissima verba*. Mark was regarded as recording the utterances of Peter (*ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρου*). In this case, Papias is at great pains to show the faithfulness and

accuracy of the rendering. Mark's was an "authorised version." In the case of Matthew no such claim could be made. "Every man translated as he was able." But Papias has his way to meet the claims of those who (as Polycarp says) "perverted the oracles of the Lord (*τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου*) to their own lusts," or as Papias himself calls them, the teachers of "alien commandments." It is the stereotyped method of contemporary apologetic. The heretics are irresponsible free-lances. The Church has (or had in the period of Papias' inquiries) the unbroken, indigenous tradition, still sounding on in its original home and language. The Church of the Apostles, Elders, and Kindred of the Lord in Jerusalem was a virgin unstained by heresy. In its oral tradition they had a guarantee against the vagaries of heresy. The true "interpretation of the Lord's oracles" (*ἐξήγησις τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων*) was therefore determinable by this "tradition of the elders the disciples of the Apostles." It was a voice not only "living" (*ζῶσα*) but, until the scattering of the Mother-Church by the War of Bar-cochba and the edict of Hadrian in 135–138, it was also actually "abiding" (*μενοῦσα*) in its original environment. The objection, therefore, that the Church had not the "Hebrew" original, and could not say (as in the case of Mark) to whom it owed its "translation," was not fatal. Inquiry from "the Elders" as to what Andrew or Peter had said, or John the seer of the Revelation, or Matthew the evangelist himself, would suffice to refute both the heretical tendencies. They could carry through neither their denial of the (physical) resurrection and judgment, against the words of "John," nor their perversion of the "commandments given by the Lord to the faith" against the reported utterances of "Matthew."

Such is the purport of Papias' account, in his preface

(προοίμιον), of his qualifications for his task, and of the authorities on which he relies. He admits Mark to a position of supplementary and subordinate authority, defending this admission at considerable length. But the Gospel of Matthew is to him, as to his contemporaries, the ultimate standard and apostolic record of the commandments (ἐντολαί) in question, the "oracles" delivered by the Lord to the faith, and "derived," like the δέκα λόγια received by Moses on Sinai, from the heavenly reservoir of absolute "truth itself."

To imagine Papias, the contemporary of Justin Martyr and the Didaché, resorting to any other authority than our own Greek Gospel of Matthew is to commit a historical anachronism. We have no ground whatever for conceiving him as referring to some unheard-of apostolic source, any more than we can reasonably maintain that the whole Christian world was mistaken, which for centuries after resorted to Papias' work as the standard account of the origin of the Gospels; and the Fathers invariably take what Papias says as applying to our Matthew and nothing else. Indeed there is something almost ludicrous in accusing them of misunderstanding an author whom they knew and we do not. The only tenable supposition is that Papias used our Matthew, believing it to be the translation by an unknown hand of an Aramaic writing composed by the Apostle Matthew. Antiquity has absolutely nothing else to report on the subject.

In reality the Gospel of Matthew is not a translation but a Greek composition whose two principal sources, Mark and the so-called Second Source, were themselves Greek when employed by this evangelist. By the same token the evangelist is most unlikely to have been an Apostle; for surely no apostolic eye-witness could be expected to resort to such a method of telling the story. Dr. W. C.

Allen does not overstate the case when he says in his excellent and conservative commentary :—

"This tradition (of Matthean authorship) and inference (of translation) is directly contradicted by the testimony of the first Gospel itself, for that work clearly shows itself to be a compilation by some one who has interwoven material from another source, or other sources, into the framework of our second Gospel. This renders it difficult to suppose that the book in its present form is the work of the Apostle Matthew. It is indeed not impossible, but it is very improbable, that an Apostle should rely on the work of another for the entire framework of his narrative. If he did so, he certainly composed his work in Greek, not in Hebrew, for the first Gospel has largely embodied the Greek phraseology of the second Gospel. It is inconceivable that the compiler should have rendered Mark's Greek into Hebrew, and that this should have afterwards been retranslated into Greek so closely resembling its Markan original."[1]

3. *Was the Title attached because of incorporated Matthean material?*

Manifestly, when brought to the acid test of the actual contents of the Gospel, nothing remains of the tradition save the bare fact that in Papias' time (for there is no earlier trace of it) the Gospel bore, as now, the title *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*. This, and this alone, constitutes the entire tradition : and even this is not given by Papias as information derived from "the Elder," or any one else. He merely states, quite as a matter of course, that the *Λόγια* which he proposes to expound were "compiled," or "taken up into a book" (*συνέγραψε*, var. lect. *συνέταξε*), by the Apostle Matthew, the assumption being that he wrote in Hebrew, since such was the language of the country. Such was the current belief regarding our first Gospel *ca.* 140–150 A.D.

But why had the name of Matthew become attached to the Gospel; and since when? The belief surely had a cause, either in real knowledge of this Apostle's activities,

[1] *I.C.C.* p. lxxx.

or else in some peculiarity of the Gospel itself leading to the inference. For such inferences are a common phenomenon when later generations become interested in questions of authentication. Knowledge, or inference: that is the alternative.

Once the discovery had been made by modern critics from the coincident material of Matthew and Luke not found in Mark (the so-called Q, or 'double-tradition' material) that the two later Synoptists employ a common source to supplement Mark, mainly in teaching rather than narrative material, it was inevitable that ancient texts should be ransacked for evidence of acquaintance with it. Absolutely in vain! The Second Source is undoubtedly there: but, as Salmon somewhat sardonically puts it, the tradition regarding it dates back only to the nineteenth century. But the temptation was irresistible to find some reference to it, if not in the utterances of Papias himself, then in some unconscious reflection of his assumed informant.

Schleiermacher was the first to recognise the extreme importance of Papias' testimony, since here, for the first time, we discover one of the Church Fathers meeting the challenge of heretics such as Basilides and Marcion with a genuine inquiry into gospel origins in an attempt to defend their impugned authenticity. Schleiermacher, however, eager to find evidence for the source discovered by internal criticism, proceeded at once to claim Papias as a conscious witness to it. In the hands of a later generation of radical opponents of tradition led by Volkmar, this effort of Schleiermacher to secure Papias as a witness to the Second Source, instead of to Matthew, as had always hitherto been understood, was carried further. Papias' testimony, Volkmar maintained, had reference neither to our Matthew nor to our Mark, but only to non-extant proto-gospels, an Ur-

Matthaeus and an Ur-Markus, which the critic could shape practically as he pleased.

The Ur-Markus theory we may here leave out of account; but Friedrich Bleek, and above all the Tübingen veteran Ad. Hilgenfeld, in his great *Einleitung* (1875), dealt the death-blow to Schleiermacher's theory of an Ur-Matthaeus witnessed by Papias. Unfortunately the theory had meantime found in England an ardent advocate in the author of *Supernatural Religion*. What widespread influence Cassel's book exerted, in spite of Westcott's *History of the Canon*, and especially Lightfoot's pulverizing *Essays*, lies within the memory and experience of those who knew the great Cambridge scholars. Cassel's influence appears even in the great discussions of the Synoptic Problem and the New Testament Introductions of our own day. For these are too often not content with the perfectly legitimate assumption of ur-evangelia to account for phenomena of the gospel text, but still resurrect from time to time the unlaid ghost of Schleiermacher's discovery of them *in Papias*.[1]

German critics of the liberal school were extremely reluctant to let go so choice a bit of testimony as the supposed witness of Papias. Perhaps the last expiring effort to retain it was that of H. J. Holtzmann, who, in his *Einleitung*, brought forward the ingenious suggestion that Papias and "the Elder" might have been talking at cross-purposes, "the Elder" referring to the Aramaic Ur-Matthaeus, while Papias would necessarily understand him to be speaking of our Matthew, the only Matthew he knew. This theory could not, of course, apply to the Matthew fragment in which there is no mention at all of the Elder, and no pretence of reporting a tradition; but Holtzmann applied

[1] A former instructor in the Yale Divinity School (McWhorter) discovered a Phoenician inscription on the leg of the Cardiff Giant.

it (rather hesitatingly) to the fragment on Mark. In this it is admittedly still Papias (not the Elder) who observes that Peter, in the preaching listened to by Mark, "had no design of making a *σύνταξις τῶι κυριακῶν λόγων* (var. *λογίων*)." But this remark may be held to imply that some other preacher had, or might have had, such a design. In making it *Papias* has, of course, our own Matthew in mind as the example of such a *σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων*; for he contrasts it with the meagre discourses and the unacceptable order of Mark. But if, by what Holtzmann called a "distinction of horizons," it could be supposed that he was unconsciously reflecting an utterance of *the Elder*, which the Elder intended to apply to the Aramaic Ur-Matthaeus, the desired testimony might be obtained, and at an earlier date. It was probably because of the extreme tenuity of this very remote possibility that the single clause in which it is expressed fails to appear in the edition of the *Einleitung* to which I now have access (1885), and it is justly rejected as wholly worthless by all continental scholars of repute that I know of, with the single exception of Harnack. Jülicher and Zahn in Germany, Wernle in Switzerland, Loisy in France, are all at one in the positive declaration that there is no trace of evidence in Papias to any Ur-Matthaeus. Neither Papias nor any other Church Father has the remotest suspicion of a Logian source other than the untranslated Matthew itself. Continental critics do not restrain their astonishment that English and American scholars should still be talking of "the Logia of Papias" or "the Ur-Matthean Logia" as if some other *σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων* were in the mind of Papias, or of his possible informants, than simply our Matthew, which, for obvious reasons, Greek writers assumed to be translated from the "Hebrew."

Oxford is not the only "place where German theories

go when they die." In this case Schleiermacher's moribund theory obtained a new lease of life first of all at Cambridge, then in Oxford, and later in America as well. I must confess to have had a share myself in perpetuating this εἴδωλον of the cave. Perhaps the fault is the more excusable from the fact that the great name of Lightfoot stands at the head of the list, while the most conspicuous offender is the author of the most scholarly New Testament Introduction in the English language, the standard English work of our times.

It is seldom one can find Hilgenfeld and Zahn in hearty agreement. When, therefore, we not only find this to be the case as regards Papias' reference to the λόγια compiled by Matthew, but find in addition the whole company of German scholars receding from a once favoured position, accompanied by all other leading continental scholars, it will be wiser to reconsider even a position assumed by Lightfoot. In his Essays on *Supernatural Religion* (p. 172), Lightfoot writes as follows of the Ur-Matthäus, the supposed "collection of discourses":—

"Hilgenfeld, while applying it (the expression συνετάξατο τὰ λόγια in Papias) to our First Gospel, explains it on grounds which at all events are perfectly tenable. He supposes that Papias mentions only the *sayings* of Christ, not because St. Matthew recorded nothing else, but because he himself was concerned only with these, and St. Matthew's Gospel, as distinguished from St. Mark's, was the greatest storehouse of materials for his purpose."

Hilgenfeld is here correctly quoted. He does understand Papias to be referring to the authoritative source whence he proposes to draw these λόγια κυριακά whose meaning was in such violent dispute before his time and after it. They are to be found arranged in an orderly σύνταξις by the Apostle Matthew, who compiled (συνετάξατο) them in his Gospel in the original language. Hilgenfeld thus understands Papias. And Hilgenfeld is right.

If there be still doubt whether this is the real meaning, I can only refer to the clear and full exegesis of the fragment in Zahn's *Introduction* (§ 54).

But Lightfoot takes exception. He states explicitly:—

"I do not, however, think that this is the right explanation."

He then proceeds to quote a sixth century author to prove that *τὰ λόγια* could be used of the entire *τετρευαγγέλιον*. Of course it could—in the sixth century (!). This, however, has no real value at all as compared with the immediate parallels of Polyc. *ad Phil.* VII., and Iren. *Haer.* I., i. 1, and I., viii. 1, where both *λόγια κυριακά*, and *λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου* are used exactly as in Papias, i.e. both in the same sense and the same context. We must judge Papias' use of the term by that of his associates and disciples, not by that of the sixth century. To them it means the "precepts," "commandments," or "divine utterances" of Jesus, recorded in many gospels, but chiefly in that compiled by the Apostle Matthew, who had given special care to their preservation "in order."

Lightfoot's seemingly unimportant divergence from the path of true historical exegesis had fateful consequences. Sanday, in his *Gospels in the Second Century*, took the next step. He actually reverts entirely to the standpoint of *Supernatural Religion*, declaring that

"Neither of the two first Gospels, as we have them, complies with the conditions of Papias' description to such an extent that we can claim Papias as a witness to them."

Thus the door is again wide open to uncontrollable Ur-Matthaeus and Ur-Markus theories. And not only so, but the learned author, careful as he habitually is in all such statements, even alleges that in the Matthew fragment

"Papias is not giving his own statement, but that of the Presbyter John." [1]

[1] Sanday, *Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 157.

The fact, as all can see, is the contrary. Papias is making his own statement: there is no mention whatever of the Presbyter John in what he says regarding Matthew.[1] Canon Sanday has the generous fault of being too gentle to his opponents. He concludes:—

"I am bound in candour to say that so far as I can see myself at present, I am inclined to agree with the author of *Supernatural Religion* against his critics, that the works to which Papias alludes cannot be our present Gospels in their present form."

We all know the noble services of Sanday to Gospel criticism since this relatively early work (1876). The last service is by no means the least, as it is certainly the bravest. But the concession to the author of *Supernatural Religion* was a very unfortunate one, which could not be, or at least was not, undone. Instead of recognising with continental scholars the complete shipwreck of Schleiermacher's view, we get both at Cambridge and at Oxford, and in America as well, the most untenable assertions as to testimony by Papias, or "the Elder," or both, to an Ur-Matthaeus as well as an Ur-Markus. We even have constant reference in such a standard Introduction as Moffatt's to "the *Logia* spoken of by Papias" just as if Papias had really known a book of this title and given the desired witness to the Second Source.

Cambridge has in addition a divagation of its own, which I will only mention, the theory to which Professor Burkitt has unfortunately given support and currency in his *Historical Transmission of the Gospels*, that the λόγια κυριακά, or λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου, which formed the subject of Papias' five books of ἐξηγήσεις, were not precepts of the Lord at all, and had nothing to do with the "commandments delivered by the Lord to the faith" as to which Papias made his inquiries, but were merely a collection of Messianic

[1] See Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 168.

prophecies from the Old Testament. Professor Rendel Harris has taken up this erratic idea with all his customary enthusiasm. In his *Testimonia* he is prepared to carry back such anthologies from the days of Cyprian to the very sources of the Gospels themselves, making the collector of customs the first collector of proof-texts.

If this sketch of the history of Schleiermacher's theory does not impress my auditors as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole attempt to interpret the Papias fragment outside the setting of its own age and environment, I can only leave it. My own more immediate subject forbids that I further pursue efforts to draw testimony from the prisoner at the bar on subjects which have never entered his mind. Our own question merely concerns the association of the name "Matthew" with the Gospel. Now all critics admit the existence of a Second Source incorporated by both our first and third evangelists to supplement the story of Mark. But if Papias has not the remotest suspicion of its existence, why should our judgment of its character, and especially its authorship, be determined by what he has to say about a totally different writing? The perverse effect of the notion that Papias described Q as a *σύνταξις τῶν λογίων*, is apparent, as it seems to me, when Harnack on otherwise quite insufficient grounds denies that the Second Source was a gospel at all, and wishes to regard it as a mere string of sayings. The Second Source did have long discourses connected by a slender thread of narrative. So do the *Clementina*. So do the early chapters of Acts. But why suppose this gospel of the teachings—for such it was—ever to have stood connected with the name of "Matthew"? It makes no pretensions of its own to apostolic authority. It does not mention the name of Matthew, and it is not written in the first person. Moreover, it has not the literary character

we should anticipate in the work of one of the Twelve. And we have no external grounds for the assumption. Neither our first nor our third evangelist gives to the Second Source the consideration due to an apostolic writing. Its *contents*, as utterances of the Lord, are of course treated with special respect: but the *evangelist's* part, i.e. the *narrative*, and the *order*, are almost completely discarded by Matthew and Luke. Both subordinate the Second Source to Mark, and Mark himself, who seems to make a very sparing use of it, subordinates it still further. The evangelists, then, do not seem to regard it as an apostolic writing. Finally, there is not one solitary writer in all antiquity who is so much as aware of its existence. Absolutely the only ground we have for calling it "Matthean" is, that Papias says that the Apostle Matthew compiled the sacred precepts of Jesus, which he (Papias) was proposing to interpret, "in the Hebrew tongue." And Papias was talking about another book altogether!

4. *If not because of incorporated material, why was the name "According to Matthew" attached to our first Gospel?*

"But," says the objector, "however ill-adapted the name 'Matthew' may seem as author of this 'Second Source,' and however out of harmony with the treatment accorded to it by our first and third evangelists, still we *must* hold that it passed as the work of Matthew, because we can conceive no other method by which this name can have become attached to our first Gospel, a writing to which it is even less adapted." Well, can we: or can we not? That is just the question before us.

I do not myself see how it is possible fairly to confront the facts and not acknowledge with the continental critics generally that we have no evidence at all for connecting the name of "Matthew" with the Second Source. But

if the name did not come by way of transfer from incorporated material, as was the case with "Nehemiah," and as many believe to have been the case with "Luke," we must fall back upon the other alternative. In this case, as in so many others, some phenomenon of the book itself caught the eye of the inquiring reader and suggested to him the apostolic name of which he was in search. The origin of the name is not knowledge but inference.

We have not far to look. It is the apologists of tradition themselves, such as Zahn, who teach us whence this suggestion could be derived.

We are all familiar with the inference commonly drawn from the alteration of Mark's story of the Call of the Publican in Matthew ix. 9 from "Levi, son of Alpheus" to "Matthew." The inference is, that the writer was himself Matthew, but that he also bore the name of Levi; and that he took this cryptic way of correcting Mark, by way of dropping a hint to the reader regarding his own identity. Those who make this inference may not be very convincing as to the fact they attempt to prove; but they are very convincing as to something they are far from wishing to prove, viz., that it is very easy to take from this curious peculiarity of Matthew ix. 9 a suggestion as to the authorship, be it correct or incorrect.

From Matthew ix. 9 it is quite possible to leap to the conclusion that the Apostle who is here called "Matthew," but in the Markan parallel "Levi son of Alpheus," must be the author of the Gospel; because Zahn and other apologists for tradition in our own time actually do this very thing, making nothing of the difficulty that, in that case, the same man will have borne two common Aramaic proper names. Moreover, the ancient apologist found such leaps of logic even easier than the modern. Unfortunately for the apologists the conclusion is not in itself a probable

one. Of course if the identification Levi = Matthew be incorrect, all theories of special knowledge collapse at once. Only on the supposition that the same man really bore both names is there room for the dubious further supposition that he took this curious way of conveying the fact to his readers. But the primary supposition is itself improbable. It is no explanation to adduce, as Zahn does, cases of Hellenised side-names such as "Saul who is also Paul," or of nick-names such as Simon "surnamed" Cephas, or Joseph "surnamed" (ἐπικληθείς) Caiaphas. In Jewish usage, so far as I know, there are no Josephs who are called Samuels, and no Johns or Matthews who are also Levis. Hence the substitution of "Matthew" for Levi in Matthew ix. 9 is much less likely to be a mysterious device by which the author of the Gospel, as it were, whispers in the reader's ear: "I am the real Levi of whom Mark relates this: I had two names, one Levi, the other Matthew," than it is to be a tacit correction on the part of some early reader of Mark.[1]

But why should any early reader of Mark wish to change the name "Levi" in the story of the Publican's Calling? And why should he pitch upon the name of "Matthew" rather than any other? On the former point the textual variants are exceedingly instructive; particularly when, as in this case, they go hand in hand with variant extra-canonical forms of the story which vainly attempt identification of this puzzling "Levi son of Alpheus," a man otherwise unknown to Christian story, save that he reappears (almost certainly in dependence on Mark) at the end of the fragment of the *Gospel of Peter*, and as "Levi" alone, without the patronymic, in the Lukan parallel.

[1] See also the objection raised by Hilgenfeld, *Einl.*, p. 453, that we should then expect Mark, who mentions the 'surnames' of Peter, James and John, to mention also that of Matthew.

The trouble with the authentic text of Mark is, that the publican, the disciple whose call to "follow" Jesus comes next after that of the original two pairs of brethren, and whose obedience to it is related in equally striking terms, *fails entirely to appear in the list of the Twelve*, which is given in the very next chapter. It was no small marve to readers of the second Gospel what was become of this notable follower; and the variants tell us how they set about removing the difficulty. One way, according to A. Wright, in his Greek Synopticon, is that followed by the "Western" texts (D ll), which substitute Λεββαῖος Λεβῆς = Λευεὶς for the name which in the ordinary texts of Matthew and Mark reads Θάδδαιος, and in Luke's parallel is Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου. Be this as it may, a more ingenious, and for us far more significant, method is the substitution in the Markan story of the Publican's Call itself of the name "James" instead of "Levi." The course of reasoning is quite obvious. Levi's father's name was Alpheus. In the list of the Twelve there is no "Levi," but there is a "James the son of Alpheus," who therefore, if not identical with Levi himself, must at least be his brother. We see, then, at an extremely early date (the reading appears in D and the Latin versions) some texts of Mark ii. 14 presented this correction, and we fully understand the reason why. It is pure conjecture.

Now for the second point. Turn to the list of the Twelve in Matthew x. 2–4. It is taken over with slight alterations from Mark iii. 16–19. The name of "Matthew" which appears eighth in the list, and not seventh as in Mark, has here appended to it the terse comment ὁ τελώνης, "the publican." Arthur Wright, in his *Synopticon*, prints the words in small type and encloses them in [ ] to indicate his belief that this is a gloss appended to the original list by some later hand. It certainly is not likely to have

formed part of the original list. But how could the glossator know that this and not some other name represented the missing hero of the Call from the Receipt of Custom? The question might be partially answered by pointing out that the first four names are excluded by the fact that their call is otherwise related, while Bartholomew's, which comes next but one, is excluded by the patronymic, leaving "Matthew" next in order. But this, while possible, is not quite a satisfactory answer, because it leaves the passing over of "Philip" unaccounted for. In fact I think it really misrepresents the actual process. We must find some other explanation.

Another peculiarity of the Matthean list is, that it arranges the Twelve in pairs. By this means Matthew, who is here eighth, comes to stand at the end of the line, whereas *James the son of Alpheus*, who comes next in order, stands at the beginning. How, then, does this affect the case? Let us suppose that, either under direct influence from the archetype of our Western form of text in Mark ii. 13 (Ἰάκωβον τον τοῦ Ἀλφαίου), or independently, along parallel lines of reasoning, some glossator of the Markan list inserted after Ἰάκωβον τον τοῦ Ἀλφαίου the harmless explanatory note ὁ τελώνης. What would become of it when our first evangelist, copying the list, put "Matthew" at the end of the line, and "James the son of Alpheus" at the beginning of the next? Surely our experience with displaced glosses teaches us that it would be very apt indeed to find a place after the preceding name "Matthew" instead of the name "James *son of Alpheus*" for which it had been intended.

Here, then, is a perfectly reasonable, or at least a possible, explanation of how in the story of the Publican's Call in our first Gospel the name "Matthew" might come to take the place of "Levi son of Alpheus." We may suppose

that the evangelist took it from the list which he gives us himself in x. 3, where the gloss (originally intended to stand after "James *son of Alpheus*") explained that this man (i.e. in the rearranged order, *Matthew*) was "the publican." The glossator thus removed the difficulty of the publican's non-appearance among the Twelve.

I do not of course advance this as what *must* have happened. To determine that is in the nature of the case impossible. I only advance it as what *may* have happened. And that is all that is required; because, e.g., Zahn, a typical champion of the tradition, rests his whole case upon the claim that "the only possible" explanation of the substitution of "Matthew" for Levi in Matthew ix. 9. is the fact that the evangelist himself was the man who was known by these diverse names.

I think I have now suggested a "possible" explanation, an explanation at least as reasonable as Zahn's. It follows that we have also a further explanation how this writing, so clearly secondary and post-apostolic, might nevertheless obtain its title. At the period in which various gospels were coming into widespread and more or less competitive circulation, it is not surprising that men should have anticipated the reasoning of Zahn from the same passage and called it "The Gospel according to Matthew": nor that, in Papias' time, it should have come to be generally regarded as the translation of a work compiled in "Hebrew" by the Apostle Matthew himself.

B. W. Bacon.

ST. MARK IV. 10-12: AN INTERPRETATION.

It may be doubted whether any portion of our Second Gospel has received more attention than has the brief passage of three verses which follows immediately after the Parable of the Sower in the fourth chapter. The usual interpretation of the words attributes to our Lord the statement that He spoke in parables in order in some way to veil the truth.

That Jesus should desire and intend to hide the truth from certain of His hearers, and should speak of the parabolic method as adopted with that end in view, presents no difficulty whatsoever to some students of His life, inasmuch as, according to them, such a purpose would be in perfect harmony with the predestinarianism of His eschatological outlook. He had now realised, we are told, that a large proportion of His hearers, as was made evident by their attitude to His message, were destined to be outside the Kingdom of Heaven: He would set the truth before them in a manner consonant with the stern logic of facts; He would hide the truth from them, revealing it only to those who had proved themselves to be predestined for the Kingdom.

It would of course be a futile task to attempt to eliminate predestinarianism from Jewish Apocalyptic or from early Christianity, and equally futile to attempt to show that our Lord's views were not in many respects the current views of His age and nation. But there were certain things in the eschatology of His day in regard to which we would fain believe that He would manifest the same independence that He manifested, for example, in His attitude to the Jewish Law. And predestinarianism is one of these. Unless there is predestination in the passage we are considering, it will

not be easy to prove from the Synoptic Gospels that it had a place in the outlook of Jesus; for the remaining Synoptic passages which have been employed for that purpose are few and inadequate.

Other students prefer to think that Jesus did not utter the words attributed to Him in verses 11 and 12 at all, and to find in their ascription to Him an attempt on the part of the Church, by means of Isaiah vi. 9, 10, where the Divine message is regarded as accountable for the attitude of those who reject it, to explain the strange fact that the Jews who listened to the preaching of Jesus were not converted by it.[1]

But is this drastic treatment necessary? It is true that the quotation from Isaiah was (to quote Dr. Sanday) "part of the common property of the apostolic age": but is not Dr. Sanday right when he adds that "the fact that it was so would be still more intelligible if the example had been set by our Lord Himself"?[2] The passage is just one of the great passages of the Old Testament which we should have expected the spiritual insight of Jesus to use: but here again we would fain believe that His independence would manifest itself, in this case by freeing the prophetic utterance from the implication that the Divine message was responsible for the hardness of those by whom it was rejected.

The question, then, to which the present paper attempts to supply an answer is this: is it possible to interpret the words ascribed to Jesus in Mark iv. 11, 12 so as to eliminate from them all statement of a causal connexion between the parabolic method and the blindness and hardness of the outsiders, and so retain them as a genuine saying of our Lord's without assuming on His part an endorsement of the predestinarianism of Apocalyptic or of the prophetic con-

[1] See, e.g., Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, pp. 108, 9.
[2] *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, p. 73.

ception of the Divine message as accountable for the plight of those who reject it?

I venture tentatively to suggest an interpretation of these two verses, which, though admittedly not in absolute accord with the text as it has come to us, yet postulates in the traditional text so slight and so easily explained a deviation from the original form, and at the same time so effectively gets rid of the difficulties of the common interpretation, that it may fairly claim to set forth the meaning of our Lord.

But first we must be clear as to the significance of the question addressed to Jesus in verse 10 by those "that were about Him with the twelve." The best attested text of Mark reads, *ἠρώτων αὐτὸν . . . τὰς παραβολάς*. The natural meaning of *ἐρωτᾶν τινά τι* is "to ask something of one," and the R.V. renders "asked of him the parables," which does not furnish a very satisfactory sense. *Ἐρωτᾶν* with the accusative is also used in the sense of "to ask *about* something," as, for example, in Plato, *Republic* 508A, *τὸν ἥλιον γάρ δῆλον ὅτι ἐρωτᾷς*, "You are clearly asking about the sun," i.e., "your question evidently alludes to the sun" (Davies and Vaughan). It would have been an improvement if the R.V. had introduced the preposition "about" into the rendering, as Dr. Moffatt does. "To ask about the parables" is indefinite enough to permit of its being construed to mean either "Why speakest thou in parables?" or "What do the parables mean?" Matthew adopts the former interpretation, Luke the latter—except that he makes the question refer to the one parable reported: *ἐπηρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τίς αὕτη εἴη ἡ παραβολή* (Luke viii. 9). Now it seems to me that the context *in Mark* makes it clear that the original question in that Gospel referred to *one* parable and was an inquiry as to its meaning, that is to say, the Marcan question was originally in substance the same as the Lucan question. Is not this put

beyond all doubt by verse 13 of Mark, where Jesus says to those who had asked the question, "Know ye not this parable? and how shall ye know all the parables?" Does not this show conclusively that their question had concerned *one* parable and that it was a request for light on the significance of that one parable? There is a fair amount of evidence for the singular reading in Mark iv. 10. This is how Swete's Critical Note sets it forth: "*την παραβολην* ***ΑΠΣ*** al min^{p} syr^{pesh} go aeth *τις η παραβολη αυτη* D 13 28 69 124 346 2^{pe} a b c f ff g i l q Or^{int} *φασον ημιν την παραβολην* **Φ**." [1] Moffatt adopts the singular in his translation, in this agreeing with the Textus Receptus and the A.V. If it be said that inasmuch as only one parable has been reported by Mark, the plural *τὰς παραβολάς* in verse 10 is, as the more difficult reading, much the more likely to have been original, it may be answered that the singular may have been converted into the plural in order to bring the question of verse 10 into harmony with the statement in verse 2: *καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλά*. What happened, as I think, was that, largely for a reason to be noted presently, the question was wrongly taken to be a request for an explanation, not of a particular parable, but of the parabolic method. When the misunderstanding occurred, the change from the singular to the plural would be facilitated by the presence of the plural in verse 2.

There are other considerations which make it most improbable that the disciples would inquire why Jesus spoke in parables. It may be that Jesus now began to employ the parabolic method to a greater degree than He had hitherto done, but the evidence is all against the method being an absolutely fresh departure at this time. Not only has Mark

[1] The Freer MS. must be added to the authorities for *τις η παραβολη αυτη*.

already given to us the Parables of the Undressed Cloth and the New Wine (ii. 21, 22); he has also told us that Jesus spake unto the scribes from Jerusalem "in parables" (iii. 23). Luke describes the sayings about the cloth and the wine as a "parable" (v. 36), as also he does the saying concerning the blind guiding the blind. It is probable also that the Parable of the Two Builders, and the Complaining Children and the Empty House had all been uttered before the Parable of the Sower. Moreover, the frequency of the parable in the Rabbinical Literature may be taken as an indication that the parabolic method was a favourite mode of teaching with the Jewish Rabbis even in the time of our Lord. This would minimize the probability that the disciples would ask Jesus *why* He made use of parables. We can have no quarrel, it is true, with Schweitzer's statement that "in this method of discourse Jesus is so pre-eminently original, that any other productions of the Jewish parabolic literature are like stunted undergrowth beside a great tree," or with his verdict regarding the attempts which have been made to show that the parables of Jesus are derived from Jewish sources, concerning which attempts he remarks that they "cannot be refuted, because they lack the foundation necessary to any theory which is to be capable of being rationally discussed—that of plain common-sense." [1] Still, the two methods were not utterly disparate; they were sufficiently akin to make it highly improbable that the disciples would ask our Lord *why* He spoke in parables. In an able and striking article on the Synoptic Parables in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April, 1915, the Rev. J. W. Hunkin, after examining some of the Rabbinical parables, draws the following conclusion: "The result of the preceding enquiry has been to shew that the style and the setting of the parables recorded in the Synoptic Gospels

[1] *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 286.

correspond very closely with the Rabbinical manner of story-telling as reflected in the Talmud and kindred Jewish sources. It is not unfair to draw from this fact the inference that the forms in which the parables have been transmitted in the Synoptic tradition is very nearly that in which they were spoken by Jesus Himself." [1]

We may, then, regard it as certain that what those around Jesus requested from Him was an explanation of the Parable of the Sower. In that case we should not expect Jesus to begin to reply by giving reasons for the adoption of the parabolic method; we should expect Him to begin at once with the interpretation of the parable; and that is exactly what Jesus does! Verses 11 and 12 are a general statement of the meaning of the Parable of the Sower. Then Jesus interrupts His own interpretation to express His surprise at the lack of insight displayed by His questioners, a defect which would keep them from understanding all the parables (verse 13); and immediately proceeds (in verses 14-20) to explain the parable in detail. It is this interruption of His own interpretation on the part of Jesus that has led to the misunderstanding of verses 11, 12; the explanation of the Parable of the Sower was supposed to start at verse 14, instead of at verse 11. Verses 11, 12 were then taken as a statement of the reasons for the adoption of the parabolic method, in accordance with which the question of verse 10 was taken to be one regarding that method, a view which involved the changing of the singular "parable" into the plural "parables." The misunderstanding of verses 11, 12 may, I think, also be naturally regarded as responsible for still another modification of the text, namely, for the substitution of παραβολαῖς for τῇ παραβολῇ in verse 11. This would be easy when the words had come to be taken not as part of the interpretation of one parable, but as a

[1] p. 381.

statement of the reason for speaking in parables. It would be interesting to know whether there is any evidence at all for the singular in verse 11.

By regarding verses 11 and 12 as a general statement of the teaching of the Parable of the Sower, we are able to give to the words an easy and natural interpretation—decidedly more so than is possible when the verses are taken as a statement of the reason for the adoption of the parabolic method. On the old interpretation the word *γίνεται* is especially harsh, so harsh that the scribe of Codex Bezæ boldly substituted *λεγεται*, a reading found also in certain other authorities. The interpretation we suggest gives to *γίνεται* a much more natural meaning. *Ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ* retains the meaning it bears in the ordinary interpretation, with the difference that the phrase, instead of giving the reason why the disciples would be able to appreciate the teaching, whether in parabolic form or not, is now regarded as a statement of the truth which the Parable of the Sower pictorially teaches concerning them. With regard to the meaning of the words we quote Professor Burkitt: "'To give the mystery of (a rite)' is simply 'to initiate into (a rite).' Mark preserves the Aramaic expression."[1]

As to the *ἵνα* which introduces verse 12, it becomes, in our suggested interpretation, the *ἵνα* of "conceived result" as Burton terms it,[2] or "contemplated result," as Sanday and Headlam, following the late Canon Evans, term it in their note on Romans xi. 11. This use of *ἵνα* in the New Testament is now generally recognized by grammarians; but it may be worth while to quote a few sentences from Canon Evans' criticism of the treatment of *ἵνα* by the N.T. Revisers which appeared in the Expositor nearly forty

[1] *Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 43.
[2] *Moods and Tenses*, p. 92.

years ago. After calling attention to the "definitive" and the "telic" uses of ἵνα the Canon proceeds: "But besides these two uses, the *definitive* and the *final* or *telic*, which are not difficult, there is a third, which is difficult. I have accustomed myself to call it, for lack of a better term, the *subjectively ecbatic* use, or the use of *contemplated result*: in which the ἵνα clause denotes a result not *actual* (this is the province of an ὥστε clause with the *indicative mood*), but contemplated or viewed by some person or other as an effect possible, probable or reasonable. One instance of this use in English is, 'Have they stumbled *that* they *should* fall?' (Rom. xi. 11), where the Greek ἵνα πέσωσιν is admirably rendered in the Vulgate *sic ut caderent*, less admirably rendered 'that they *might* fall' by the learned Revisers, who in this instance preferred the *telic* to the *ecbatic*, and the view of Meyer and Alford to that of Origen and Chrysostom." [1] Speaking on a later page of this use of a ἵνα clause to express contemplated result, the Canon says: "The difficulty is to determine the direction of the subjectivity and its whereabouts, in *what mind* the conception resides; whether, for instance, the contemplated result is contemplated as such by one who is moving in the action or by others outside the action. This ambiguity may be removed to the reader by the translator supplying a link of connexion in the form of a brief phrase inserted between the context and the ἵνα clause; such a link as *a fact requiring* or *giving occasion* or *making it possible* or *desirable* or *reasonable* that. But in a rigorous translation like that of a Version such ellipses can hardly be inserted. To be sure, in the Latin Vulgate we find a clever instance of a curt *sic* inserted in Romans xi. 11, where ἵνα πέσωσιν is lucidly rendered *sic ut caderent*, 'that they should fall' or 'in such wise as to fall.'" [2]

[1] Expositor, Ser. 2, Vol. 3 (June, 1882), pp. 457, 8.
[2] p. 463.

Now if we take the ἵνα in this way, and if moreover in the last clause of verse 11 we read (for reasons already stated) not ἐν παραβολαῖς but ἐν τῇ παραβολῇ, we find that verses 11 and 12 give us an admirable résumé of the Parable of the Sower. In answer to the disciples' question regarding the significance of the parable, Jesus states its meaning thus: "*You* have been initiated into the Kingdom of God, but for *those who are outside* all things happen in the parable that beholding they should behold and not see, and hearing they should hear and not understand, lest haply they should turn and it should be forgiven them." This is the literal rendering of the words; they may be paraphrased as follows: "You ask me what the parable I have just spoken means. The seed that falls into the good soil represents *you* who have been initiated into the Kingdom; but the parable also represents all the various things that happen to keep those who fail to enter the Kingdom from attaining more than a superficial acquaintance with the truth—the things that prevent them from really seeing and understanding, and so turning to God and obtaining forgiveness."

This way of taking the verses is free from all the difficulties already noticed inasmuch as it removes the suggestion of causal connexion between our Lord's teaching and the plight of those who rejected it. While I maintain that this interpretation suits the Greek better than the common interpretation, I will not pretend that the language is *exactly* that in which one would expect the meaning I find in verses 11 and 12 to be couched. But a twofold allowance must be made: we must not forget, in the first place, the possibility that the Greek may not be the exact reproduction of the original Aramaic, and, in the second place, the probability that slight changes have been introduced after the words had been misunderstood.

If it be objected that our interpretation is out of harmony

with the πάντα, inasmuch as the parable obviously does not present *all* the causes of failure to absorb the truth, it may be noted that neither does the usual interpretation suit the πάντα, for the whole of our Lord's teaching to those outside was not given in parables. But a more satisfactory answer to the objection—because less of an *argumentum ad hominem*—is not far to seek. If the Parable of the Sower does not mention all the causes of failure—a thing clearly impossible—it does nevertheless call attention to all the three classes to one of which *every* cause of failure belongs. One of the first lessons in psychology is that there are three ultimate modes of consciousness, the cognitive attitude, the feeling attitude, the conative attitude. Now truth fails to achieve its purpose unless it moves the will, and the failure may be due to some fault in cognition or in emotion or in the will itself. It is significant that the Parable depicts these three classes of faults—and there is no other. The seed that rests on the surface of the well-trodden path represents those who fail to understand, to grasp, the truth. Theirs is failure in cognition. The seed that falls upon the rocky ground stands for those whose emotion is quickly stirred—but it is only the surface that is touched, there is no depth of feeling, no sufficient stirring of the emotion to move the will. The third class, represented by the seed that falls among thorns, consists of those whose will gets its opportunity—but there are other things competing for its allegiance and the will fails! The seed that falls on good soil denotes those who are free from all these faults. To them is given "the mystery of the Kingdom of God"—they alone know what the truth of God can do for man.

J. Hugh Michael.

DR. SANDAY.

By the death of Dr. William Sanday we have lost our most eminent, our most representative, New Testament scholar. Death at seventy-seven can hardly be called premature; yet though physically very feeble he was still alert and vigorous in mind. His letters betrayed no incipient decline and he was himself looking forward to freedom from official duties as an opportunity for undistracted literary work. It seemed as if we might reasonably hope for some articles or even books: and it would have been especially interesting to ascertain more fully how the theological change through which he had passed in his last decade had affected his attitude on problems of literary and historical criticism. In particular we should have been glad to know in much fuller detail how his views on the criticism of the Gospels had been altered, and especially the Fourth Gospel.

My friendship with him had lasted for about the third of a century. He had instituted a Seminar for the study of early Christianity and its environment and I was one of its earliest members and for a time acted as its secretary. I saw a good deal of him in the following years, and even after I left Oxford I used to see him during my not infrequent visits, and when I was much more rarely in Oxford we still corresponded. I have always been very grateful that at a critical period I came under the influence of two such men as Dr. Fairbairn and Dr. Sanday. I was never actually one of Dr. Sanday's pupils, but it was a privilege to work with him and under him in his Seminar and to have the benefit of his

counsel and learning. I received from him many acts of kindness, one I may be permitted to mention. As a memento of my association with him as secretary of his Seminar, he gave me a copy of the first edition of Lightfoot's *Ignatius and Polycarp*. This would in any case have been welcome both for its intrinsic value and as coming from him ; but what gave it a peculiar interest and worth was that it was a presentation copy to him from the author. He told me this and added that he could give it me without any violation of piety because the executors had presented to him the Bishop's own copy of the second edition. The work with Dr. Sanday's autograph inscription of presentation is one of the most cherished treasures of my library.

His career began with a work on the Fourth Gospel. I refer, of course, to *The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel Considered in Reference to the Contents of the Gospel Itself* (1872). He returned to the subject again and again—in his series of articles in the EXPOSITOR, his reply to Schürer in *The Contemporary Review*, and especially his volume of American lectures *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* (1905). Throughout these writings, with all their adjustment to the movement of the debate, Dr. Sanday occupied substantially the same position. But in his last volume, *Divine Overruling*, published in the present year, he says : " I am afraid there is one important point on which I was probably wrong—the Fourth Gospel. The problem is very complex and difficult ; and I have such a love of simplicity that I expect my tendency was to simplify too much, and to try too much to reach a solution on the ground of common sense " (p. 61). I should have been deeply interested to know precisely what view he had substituted for that which for forty years he had so brilliantly and tenaciously defended. The change itself was occasioned by his altered attitude to miracles. At the beginning of his

career he had definitely postponed the question. He felt that it ought to remain in abeyance till he had thoroughly examined the documents, especially their Lower and Higher Criticism. Till that had been done a decision on the ultimate problems was premature.

To criticism, then, he devoted himself in the first instance and it remained throughout his career one of his primary interests. Not that he considered it an end in itself but that he had no trust in a superstructure, whether historical or dogmatic, which did not rest on foundations well and securely laid. He gave himself the most careful preparation. His first book was published before he was thirty and it displayed a width of learning and a ripeness of judgment remarkable in one so young. It is interesting, for example, to observe that he had already accepted, at least provisionally, the conclusions on the Synoptic problem to which he adhered throughout and which still command the assent of most New Testament critics. He enumerates the following positions, "the documentary origin of the Synoptic Gospels, the priority of St. Mark, the existence of two main documents, and the independent use of them by the Evangelists." In view of the prestige given to the oral theory by Westcott it says much for his critical discernment and independence that he should regard the documentary origin of the Gospels as almost conclusively proved. His mastery alike of critical method and practice was still more conspicuous in his *Gospels in the Second Century*, published four years later (1876). In his Bampton Lectures on *Inspiration* (1893) he gave a survey of Old Testament as well as of New Testament criticism, and this wider range had been taken in his earlier and slighter volume, *The Oracles of God* (1891). Generally, however, he confined himself to the New Testament and here two of the finest specimens of his learning, his critical skill and his balance of judgment are to

be found in the lectures on the Fourth Gospel already mentioned and his *Life of Christ in Recent Research* (1907). The Commentary on Romans was mainly, of course, a contribution to exegesis and the work was shared with Dr. Headlam, so that little can be said with confidence of his share in it. But presumably part of the critical sections, both textual and literary, were contributed by him. In Lower Criticism special attention should be drawn to his co-operation with Bishop Wordsworth in the editorship of *Old Latin Biblical Texts*. I believe that he regarded this work as the best he ever did.

As a critic Dr. Sanday was eminently cautious and circumspect and essentially conservative. But he was also courageous; above all his eye was single and he would not manipulate the evidence to secure a desired result. He had no love for extremes, and if he broke with a stiff adhesion to tradition he was cool in his attitude to ingenious but unsubstantial novelties. He was not a Hebraist and the Old Testament was not his subject. But he followed the critical debate on the Old Testament carefully, and his competence in the New Testament field gave particular value to his acceptance of the main results of Old Testament criticism. At the time when his *Oracles of God* and his *Bampton Lectures* were published, his independent verdict was a real contribution to the triumph of the critical case. He believed that the Grafian theory had been established. Yet he anticipated some modification and even a measure of reaction. When in 1891 I was undertaking a course of lectures on Old Testament Theology he recommended Schlotmann to me in preference to Schultz. But his freedom in the criticism of the New Testament was, I think, more remarkable and more courageous, since here a much slighter deviation from tradition is more warmly resented. Already in 1872, speaking of the Resurrection narratives, he said: "That of St.

Matthew is of these the least trustworthy. It is comparatively late in date, and it is highly probable that legendary matter has been mixed up with it." The story of Peter walking on the water (Matt. xiv. 28-31) he suspects to have been derived from Peter's action as recorded in John xxi. 7. The miraculous draught of fishes in Luke v. is thought to be identical with that in John xxi. and to belong to the period after the resurrection. The volume is, in the author's judgment, the presentation of a conclusive case for the apostolic authorship and historical character of the Fourth Gospel. Yet it is freely allowed that the discourses have an element of subjectivity. They have undergone a sensible modification in John's mind, are deeply tinged with the individuality of the evangelist. The discourse in the Upper Room contains portions of different discourses and the writer has moulded and developed their substance. There is a proleptic element in the High-Priestly prayer, derived from the consciousness of the Apostle. The final conclusion is, "It cannot, I think, be denied that the discourses are to a certain extent unauthentic, but this is rather in form and disposition than in matter and substance." I think that it required some courage for an English defender of the Fourth Gospel to say these things half a century ago.

When this work was written he had clearly recognised that criticism, if it is to be true to its ideal, must be disinterested and unbiassed, though this receives a more definite expression in his second book. "No work is so good as that which is done without sight of the object to which it is tending and where the workman has only his measure and his rule to trust to" (p. 14). Yet he did not push the claim of criticism to an illegitimate point. He recognised that it was a special science which had its indispensable contribution to make, but which must at the end co-operate with other lines of investigation in the final synthesis. He

even allowed a certain place to the argument from consequences while admitting that it ought to be applied with great caution (p. 350). He was also sensitive to the clash between the spiritual and the critical faculties. On this I may quote a striking passage :

> " One of the great dangers and drawbacks to the exercise of the critical faculty is that it tends to destroy the spiritual intuition. And just in like manner the too great reliance upon this intuition benumbs and impoverishes the critical faculty. Yet, in a mind that should present at all adequately the internal evidence of the Gospels, both should co-exist in equal balance and proportion " (p. 349).

He adds that the asceticism of a life would be a necessary discipline, and that such a life as the world has seldom seen. Yet he had an overwhelming sense of the necessity of criticism and a firm conviction of its efficacy. " There is no limit," he said in the preface to his first book, " to the efficacy of scientific method if it is but faithfully and persistently applied." For his own part he did not presume to grapple with the great questions of theology at their centre : but he desired to approach the task " as near to it as I can and dare." His plan was to take up a single question at a time, beginning on the critical side, taking first the Fourth Gospel, then the origin and composition of the Synoptic Gospels and finally New Testament Theology. He felt that speculative systems were in the air until the facts of history and criticism were actually determined.

No attentive reader could miss in his first two books a feature which became still more significant in the light of his later development. I refer to his pre-occupation with the problem of miracles. His own account of the history of his attitude on this matter is to be found in the pamphlet *Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism*, pp. 31 ff. All his career, he says, led up to this subject. He determined to attack the central problem not first but last.

"Whatever might be the best method for others, I had little doubt that this was the best for me.

"I began at the foot of the ladder. I first sought to make myself at home in the field of the Lower Criticism, and then to rise to the Higher. I thought that the first thing we wanted was accurate texts, and then to assign these texts to their proper surroundings in place and time. This was preliminary to the construction of an historical background. But everything that could be regarded as *a priori* or philosophical I was content to leave in suspense" (p. 22).

When we turn to his earliest works we may doubt whether the suspense of judgment was so absolute as the language seems to suggest. He recognises that elements of superstition are mixed up in the record, that there is a manifest gap between the reality and the story of it, that wonder-seeking curiosity may have coloured the account, that we cannot distinguish with accuracy between the subjective and objective in the report. With all this admitted, he says: "But that miracles, or what we call such, did in some shape take place, is, I believe, simply a matter of attested fact." The historicity of the raising of Lazarus and the resurrection of Christ is defended. And certainly the impression made by his later discussions down to his *Life of Christ in Recent Research* is that he accepted the historicity of the miracles in general. At the same time he says definitely in his first book that since the question is a balance between the *a priori* improbability on the one hand and the historical evidence on the other, the proper attitude, where the value of the historical evidence is in question, is to assume provisionally that miracles are credible and to ascertain the weight of the evidence for them drawn from the general character of the narrative (p. 48). His position seems to have remained substantially the same till the end of 1912. Then he came to distinguish between miracles which were *supra naturam* and miracles *contra naturam*. The former involved no real breach in the order of nature and

could be accounted for by the presence of a unique personality and the new spiritual force which flowed from it. The other group implied a breach. It included the so-called nature-miracles in which there was a substantial element of truth, but the element of prodigy came in under the influence of the Old Testament. There remained in this group the supernatural Birth and the supernatural Resurrection. He came to feel that these also could no longer be accepted as literal fact. He himself accepted the belief in both, but not in the conception without human paternity or the resuscitation of the dead body from the tomb. Whatever was necessary to secure that every circumstance of holiness should attend the coming of the Only-begotten into the world was present. "I do not doubt," he says, "that the Birth of our Lord was sanctified in every physical respect in the most perfect manner conceivable." The rejection of the miracles which were against Nature he regarded as a great help to faith. It meant the removal of one little, nay infinitesimal, submerged rock in our mental navigation of the universe, a rock on which there had been many a shipwreck of faith. His position was defended at length in the friendly discussion with Mr. N. P. Williams, published under the title *Form and Content in the Christian Tradition.* And he returned to the subject in his last volume, *Divine Overruling.*

It is not for me to discuss Dr. Sanday's view, but I will say in a sentence or two how it strikes me. I have for many years believed that faith in the Divinity of our Lord and the reality of the Incarnation is not indissolubly connected with a belief in the supernatural conception or the physical Resurrection. On the other hand, it is obvious that if these miracles really occurred they must have significance; though whether we are competent to explain what that significance may be is another matter. Further, in view of the uniqueness of the Personality, confessed and, indeed, emphasised

by Dr. Sanday, I could feel no confidence in pressing the distinction between the two types of miracle and marking the one for acceptance and the other for rejection.

But his new attitude on the problem of miracles involved no change in his belief as to the Deity of Christ. Speaking of the Creeds he says: "The central truth which it is most important to guarantee is the true Godhead of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: that our Lord Jesus Christ is truly God and truly Lord, very God and at the same time very Man." But on the problem of the Incarnation he had somewhat earlier taken a line of his own. He had for several years been interested in the problem of personality and drawn to the study of psychology. He applied the conception of the subliminal self to the solution of the problem. In our own experience the subliminal self is the "proper and natural sphere of Divine influence upon the soul." So he believed that this was true also in the case of Christ. The normal locus of the Divine element in His personality was in the region below consciousness. This he expounded in his *Christologies Ancient and Modern* (1910), and he reaffirmed his view, though in a revised and completed form, in *Personality in Christ and Ourselves* (1911). The theory attracted a good deal of attention at the time and not a little criticism. I think the author's later development did not affect it. My impression is that it has not found very wide acceptance.

Christologies Ancient and Modern was one of a series of volumes which he wrote in preparation for his long promised *Life of Christ*. The first of this series, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels* (1903), was partly intended to lighten the *Life* of some topographical matter, but he also desired to indicate the contribution to problems of topography given by literary criticism. The volume was most interesting and admirably illustrated. It is rather curious that no sooner was it published than an article appeared in the *Journal of Theolo*

gical Studies withdrawing the identification of Capernaum with Khân Minyeh and accepting the identification with Tell Ḥum.

The second volume of this series was *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* (1905). This has always seemed to me a particularly valuable piece of work, showing Dr. Sanday at his best. It is singularly interesting, it exhibits wide and accurate familiarity with the literature of the subject, its presentation of the case is true to the best critical tradition, in short it is a model of its kind. In his earliest book he had expressed the opinion that the external evidence was inconclusive but that the internal was decisive for apostolic authorship. In its successor a special chapter was devoted to the external evidence. He had done good service by correcting, in his reply to Schürer, the common impression in Germany that British defenders of the Johannine authorship rested their case primarily on the external evidence. In *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* the discussion is very largely concerned with the internal evidence: but there are a few pages on the external evidence as to which the view is taken that the internal argument for the authentic character of the Gospel is met and strongly corroborated by the nature of the external evidence. It is interesting that Dr. Drummond attached decisive weight to the external rather than the internal evidence.

The companion volume, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research* (1907), makes a more mingled impression. It offers a good deal more than the title promises, and, personally, I should have liked the book better if it had been limited to what was strictly relevant to the title. The chapter on The Symbolism of the Bible, the reviews of Moberly and Du Bose, the sermon on angels might well have gone between other covers. They are, of course, interesting and suggestive, but Dr. Sanday's gifts were primarily those of the critic and

historian rather than of the philosopher and theologian. The central part of the book sketching the development of research from 1888 to the time of publication is, perhaps, not better done than the corresponding sketch on the criticism of the Fourth Gospel, both being exceptionally good, but it is more stimulating, central and momentous. The period under review had been rich in important contributions which had raised new and far-reaching problems. The first edition of J. Weiss's *Jesus' Preaching of the Kingdom of God*, Wrede's *Messianic Secret*, Wellhausen's commentaries on the Synoptists and the first edition of his *Introduction*, Harnack's earlier works on the authorship of the Lucan writings and on Q, Holtzmann's *Messianic Consciousness of Jesus*, the literature on the Son of Man problem from Lietzmann's monograph onwards, are among the more noteworthy works described and judged by Dr. Sanday. One feature of his review helped to make history. This was the prominence he gave to Schweitzer's *From Reimarus to Wrede* and to his earlier little work *The Secret of the Messiahship and the Passion*. German opinion had, I think, not been specially influenced by Schweitzer, essentially he had little to say on the eschatological problem that had not been said before, though his tendency-sketch of the development of investigation into the Life of Jesus was both brilliant and instructive. The general drift of German opinion was, I imagine, pretty faithfully reflected in Jülicher's *Neue Linien* with its sarcastic opening chapter, "The Epoch 1901." Dr. Sanday, however, was deeply impressed by it, and the eschatological theory of the Gospels became very fashionable among ourselves, while the prominence he gave to Schweitzer's larger work was not, I believe, without its reaction on German opinion. We may take comfort in the fact that in course of time things find their level. And at this point I may fitly quote a few lines from the previous volume of

lectures, published the year before *From Reimarus to Wrede* appeared. Dr. Sanday was illustrating the wonderful faculty for correcting itself exhibited by German criticism. After quoting as examples the discussions on the Son of Man and the Messianic Secret he proceeds :

> "In like manner the extravagant estimate of the apocalyptic element in the Gospels which has been in vogue in recent years seems to be reducing itself to sounder dimensions. In each case there is error ; but in each case the error is corrected, and something is learnt and gained by the way."

We may hope that the extravagance of eschatological interpretation will be reduced within more reasonable limits.

The great work which was to crown these preliminary studies remained unwritten. He still cherished the hope of writing it in 1914, when I was talking with him about it. He told me that he was getting forward with it, "in my head, I mean," he added to my dismay. Not a page, I think he said, was ready for print. He explained that he had grown more radical in his views ; and it was only a little later that his reply to Bishop Gore was published. His new development no doubt had meant considerable dislocation of his plans, and a few months later the war broke out. This almost entirely absorbed him and some time later he wrote to tell me that his *Life of Christ* would never be written. His sense of the magnitude of the task had also grown. It so happened that in April of the present year I took the occasion of his retirement to devote my Editorial Notes in the *Holborn Review* to some estimate of his work. He acknowledged this in handsome terms. I had indicated the qualifications which seemed to me essential for anyone who would write, so far as such a thing is possible, an adequate Life of Christ. He fully endorsed what I said, but added that he had not himself got much beyond recognising that

they were necessary. He said that it would take two of his lifetimes to accomplish the task.

This singular and unaffected humility was very characteristic of him. It came to expression again and again in his books and in his letters. I may take a touching expression of it from his latest book:

"The landmarks of my life have been landmarks in a process of self-education. The results lie on the table, and they are what they are. If you think that there ought to be more to show, I quite agree. But the defect is radical. I doubt very much whether I have had it in me to do much more than I have. I am really a slow worker; what I have written at all rapidly has almost always been written more or less at heat. The process of incubation has usually been a long one. I have not—I know that I have not—a capacious brain. When I know what I want to say, it often costs me a considerable effort to say it. I have spent more time than most men over rough copies. If the world cared to estimate what it owed to me, a large part would consist in what it has been spared. A great deal of bad work of mine has never seen the light.

"There are just two things that I can say for myself. My work, such as it is, has always taken precedence of everything else. And I have not been sparing of self-criticism. I have aimed at simplicity and clearness; and I have not been satisfied until I had attained something of those qualities." (*Divine Overruling*, pp. 61 f.)

Those who are deeply indebted to his writings and still more those who had the privilege of his friendship will cherish the memory of his humility, and, perhaps, profit by its example. But mindful of what he did and of what he was, their own feeling towards him will be one of affectionate pride and gratitude. He could be severe in his criticism and his frankness must have sometimes made its victims wince; but he was generous in admiration and noble in his praise. The fairness and impartiality of his judgment, the sympathetic imagination with which he entered into alien forms of experience or opinions he could not share, the warmth and loyalty of his friendship, these will remain among our precious memories. His lofty conception of the responsibility which rested on the historian and the critic,

his austere devotion to Truth, his refusal to tamper with its sacred obligations in the alleged interests of Apologetic, helped to lift and keep the standard high. His exquisitely balanced scales with their diamond weights were a rebuke to slovenly methods and rough and ready results. He set an example of patience, caution, and accuracy which has made the conscience of scholars more sensitive. He was free from all that was parochial or insular, he rose steadily above national limitations, he had the international outlook and temper. His criticism had the English qualities of practical sagacity and virile good sense, but he corrected its limitations by an exceptional familiarity with the movement of critical science in Germany. Few approached him in the balance of his judgment on German contributions to Biblical scholarship.

This accurate scholarship, wide and profound learning, were combined with a sweet and simple piety and a character unspotted from the world. He gave the impression of a personality good by nature and sound to the core, chastened by self-discipline and drawing its strength and beauty from secret springs. He was restrained, almost ascetic, in the expression of his inmost experience, facile raptures were uncongenial to him. But he commanded our reverence for the saint as inevitably as he had won our affection for the man.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

WILLIAM SANDAY.

It is very fitting that some notice should be taken here of the career and work of the late Canon Sanday, as he was one of the oldest contributors to the Expositor. As far back as 1876 when its publication began, he appears in the list of contributors, and he continued to contribute until 1916, when his last article appeared, entitled "The Poor in Spirit: Ancient and Modern."

It would be hazardous for any one writer to attempt to sum up the diverse achievements of Dr. Sanday. His experience was wide and his interests were never narrow. Educated at Repton school, he came there under the influence of the headmaster, the Reverend Dr. Pears, to whose character and influence he pays a beautiful tribute in the dedication of his *Gospels in the Second Century*. He began his Oxford undergraduate career at Balliol, and finished it as a Scholar of Corpus. Elected Fellow of Trinity in 1866 at the age of twenty three, he was also a lecturer there for three years, presumably in classics, as he had taken a first class both in Moderations and in Litterae Humaniores. He had been ordained in 1867, and for seven years (1869-1876) was engaged in parish work in various parts of England. By the end of that period he had established his reputation as one of the coming men in New Testament scholarship, and for the next seven years he held the position of Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall, Durham. His association with Bishop Lightfoot for two of these years as examining chaplain can only have deepened his interest in the studies he had made his own. Certainly no Oxford man ever had a greater respect for Cambridge scholarship than Sanday. At the age of forty he was called back to Oxford as Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis

and Tutorial Fellow of Exeter College. After twelve years he became Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, positions which he resigned only last year. It is understood that he was offered at one time the Deanery of Exeter, but that after going down to look at it he decided to remain in Oxford. He was the last of the Oxford preachers at Whitehall, and had been Chaplain in Ordinary to H.M. the King since 1903. (The *Court Circular* recorded that His Majesty was represented at the funeral by Canon Sheppard of the Chapel Royal.) He received various other honours in Oxford and elsewhere, of which that of Delegate of the Clarendon Press deserves special mention, seeing that Sanday had much to do in that capacity with the theological publications of the Press for a considerable period.

From this bare enumeration it will be seen that Sanday had wide experience as scholar, theologian, lecturer, tutor, pastor, examiner, administrator, preacher, professor and author. In due time we shall doubtless be in possession of competent information about him under all these heads. It is a strange fact that though I was privileged to be intimate with him during the last seventeen years of his life to a greater degree than any other Scotsman, I have never heard him either preach or lecture. My knowledge of him was gained during seven or eight years at his *Seminar*, as well as in the more familiar converse of the afternoon walk and the tea-hour. Of the personality of the man I have been allowed to furnish some reminiscences in the *British Weekly* for September 23, and I do not propose here to enlarge upon his saintly character and lovable disposition. My aim in these pages is a threefold one. I wish to recall some fragments of his autobiography as communicated to a select audience in 1909, to sum up briefly his achievements in the sphere of New Testament

textual criticism, and to give some account of his smaller *Seminar* for the study of one part of that subject, the evidence of patristic quotations.

On Wednesday, October 13, 1909, Dr. Sanday was presented with his portrait, the work of Mr. L. Campbell Taylor, an artist chosen by himself. This portrait is intended to hang in the lodgings of the Lady Margaret professors for all time. The gathering at the presentation was a memorable one, and the professor spoke at considerable length.[1] Among his utterances were these: — "I am not a scholar, where a scholar comes. I am not an able man, where an able man comes. I am certainly not a good writer, where a good writer comes. . . . I doubt if even my intimate friends know what an amount of trouble it has cost me to make many of my writings as passable as they are. Very often it is only by some happy conjunction of fate, by some kind providence, that they will bear inspection at all. If there is one thing that I can say for myself, it is only this, that I don't spare rough copies. . . . Perhaps the best that could be claimed for me would be a certain rightness of aim. Or 'rightness' may be too strong a word. Of course I am criticised, both on the right hand and on the left. But that does not much move me. It may be the case that I see rather further, in one direction, than my critics on the right, and in another, than my critics on the left. In any case I have a strong feeling that, whether I am right or wrong, it has been a good thing that there should be somebody to take the kind of line I have taken.

". . . First, there are the two youthful productions, written while I was more or less engaged in parish work, *The Fourth Gospel* (1872), and *The Gospels in the Second Century* (1876). I am not ashamed of these,

[1] I am indebted to the full report in the *Oxford Chronicle* of October 15, 1909.

though the earlier book would be very much out of date at the present time, and the latter was concerned with a passing controversy. I have forgotten very much what there is in this second book, but I suspect that it would be found to contain the germ of most that I have been able to offer in the way of critical method ever since. . . . All my building up is really slow: it is a necessity for me to go over ground several times before I can produce a tolerable result. When I was elected to the Ireland Chair, and through the kindness of Exeter College I was enabled to come back to Oxford, there falls in the early period of my tenure what is, I am afraid, the only work of mine that can be called strictly exploratory and scientific, my contribution to 'Old Latin Biblical Texts' (Part II) (1886), and an essay on *The Cheltenham List of the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament and of the Writings of Cyprian* in 'Studia Biblica' (vol. iii.) (1891). I believe that Dr. Hort already knew all, or very nearly all, that I made out about the Old Latin Texts, but to me it came as a discovery; and there was, perhaps, something of discovery in the treatment of the groupings in the MSS. of the writings of Cyprian. . . . The [Bampton] Lectures . . . are not all that I could have wished. They are, for one thing, rather more eloquent than I like. Perhaps I may say that I have returned to the subject—I hope for the last time, or substantially the last time, because I feel that there is still something perhaps to be added another day—in the article 'Bible' in the forthcoming volume of Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. . . . The principal product of the latter half of my Ireland tenure was my share in the 'Commentary on Romans' (1895). . . . I am thankful that my part is not worse than it is; but it must not be supposed that I am really satisfied with it, because the latest editions have been unchanged. But to re-write the book as it ought

to be re-written would be too large a task along with the others that I have on hand. . . . I confess that it was a pleasure to me to see that the Theological Faculty of the University of Göttingen, when they gave me the degree of D.D. the other day, laid stress on the illustrations from Jewish sources (Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha) in the commentary: such illustrations are common now, but we were rather in front of the fashion at the time when the book appeared."

These words were followed by an acknowledgement of deep indebtedness to Matthew Arnold. "Matthew Arnold was, in fact, a conspicuous example of that lay theology which is to me very attractive." After acknowledging the powerful influence of Robert Moberly on him, he referred to the article 'Jesus Christ' in Hastings' *Dictionary*. "This is far short of what it might have been when it was written, and very far short of what such an article should be at the present time: and yet it is perhaps as good, and even somewhat better than I could have expected to make it. Since the date of its appearance I have had definitely before me the larger work that I have undertaken on the same subject. But I am sorry to say that there is as yet little actually on paper that is likely to stand in the ultimate composition of the book. At the same time I do not honestly think that I could very well have done otherwise than I have done. I will explain in a moment why. It is due to defects of mental constitution of which I had to take account. I found it necessary to attack the work to some extent piecemeal, by a succession of smaller volumes, for the most part occasional in their character, but all of them subsidiary to the main object. First there was *Sacred Sites of the Gospels* (1903), which soon died a natural death, as it deserved to die; it has, however, I hope, been a considerable help to me.

". . . This will then leave me face to face with the one main object of the rest of my days. I must prepare you for the possibility that it may never come to anything. Whether it does will depend in part on the length of days allotted to me. I need not say—you will guess only too well—that I am constantly staggered at the magnitude of the task before me. And yet I have a kind of feeling, an 'Ahnung' as the Germans would call it, that—in spite of all the thousand things that may be said and felt to the contrary—it may perhaps be in the books of heaven that I am to finish my task. I believe, with Hamlet and the Gospels, that 'there is a special providence in the fall of a sparrow.' I am not sure that this is not the most intense of all my beliefs. And, if there have been any special providences in my life—and I am sure that it has been full of them—I cannot help thinking that they point in the direction of its being finished. In particular I cannot suppress the surmise that, doubtless amongst many other good purposes that take effect in another world as well as in this, the year 1904 [in which his wife died] was sent to me specially in order that I might be less unfit to write what I have undertaken to write.

"I said a moment ago that I would explain why some things are necessary for me that would not be necessary for many other people. The chief reason among them is very simple—just plain shortness of brains. It is a secret—perhaps not a secret—that I know I have told some of my friends before. I will undertake to say that my head is the smallest man's head in this room. Most hats go down over my ears. And the consequence is that the head will simply not hold as much at a time as it ought to do. I can't trust my memory. Data are not present to my mind with the clearness and precision that I could wish. And the formative processes are often sluggish. The fact is that I was

made in most respects for small tasks, and I have undertaken a big one: there is the whole problem in a nutshell.

"... I must husband my resources. I must concentrate. I must simplify life all I can. ... I am really almost always used up and good for nothing at the end of the day. ... If my friends will kindly let me go on as I am, it will certainly be (as it has been) much better for my health, and much better for my work. With this last petition I will close, and with the expression of my deepest and sincerest thanks." This autobiographical fragment is of uncommon interest, conspicuous alike for modesty and for caution. We pass from it to a consideration of Sanday's published services to New Testament textual criticism.

The chapter on Marcion in *The Gospels in the Second Century* is an excellent piece of work. In it the question of Marcion's "Gospel" is handled with consummate skill. The priority of Luke over Marcion is successfully vindicated, and the examination of certain passages of the text is in the line of the very best tradition of textual work. It anticipates some of the work which Zahn carried out later with greater fulness. The little paper on the Rossano codex of the Gospels fitly characterises its text and brings its connexion with the other purple MS. (N) into relief. Von Soden further developed this thesis many years after in the introduction to his Greek New Testament, adding the conjecture that these MSS. represent the text of the Great Cappadocian Fathers.

Another paper from the same volume (*Studia Biblica*, vol. i.), "Some Further Remarks on the Corbey St. James (ff)" contained, I think, the first public intimation of the extensive independent research that Dr. Sanday had made into the *Latin* authorities for the New Testament text. Having been privileged to see some of his materials, with

the elaborate use of coloured pencils and inks. I can testify to the thoroughness with which this tedious work was undertaken. He was led to the important principle, stated on page 235: "The MSS. must be dealt with singly: they must be collated together point by point: the peculiar element in each must be isolated: and its structure and composition must be thoroughly studied." A sound basis for future investigation of Latin texts was laid in this work and also in the full discussion of codex *k* (Bobiensis) in the second volume of *Old Latin Biblical Texts*. Sanday was the first to show with absolute clearness the importance of classifying the Latin equivalents for particular Greek words and idioms. Professor Burkitt has carried this method farther, and in dedicating his *The Old Latin and the Itala* (Cambridge, 1896) to Sanday, he speaks of "this attempt to build by the methods he has taught on the foundations he has laid." It is a work of the utmost fascination which grows more and more delightful the more perfect the tools with which we are furnished. His demonstration of the identity of Cyprian's text with that represented by *k* has been most fruitful for all succeeding investigations, and he has proved to the satisfaction of everyone which family of Cyprianic manuscripts is the most to be relied on.[1] Only less important are the proof of the character of *e* (codex Palatinus) of the Gospels, and the discussion of other fragmentary Gospel texts. The same volume also contains a study of the Greek text underlying *k* and the beginning of a classification of the contents of Cyprianic manuscripts, which was later carried much farther by the researches of Hans von Soden (*Die Cyprianische Briefsammlung*, Leipzig, 1904).

In 1889 appeared the most valuable "Appendices" to

[1] The new text of Optatus (ed. Ziwsa) gives *inculcent*, not *conculcent* (*OLBT*, pp. lxxxvii. f.), a striking confirmation of Sanday's view.

the Estienne New Testament text. The first part furnishes a complete collation of the Westcott-Hort with the Estienne text, prepared for the most part by Rev. H. J. White, now Dean of Christ Church, and Rev. Fred A. Overton. The second part contains an apparatus of important variants covering the whole of the New Testament. Great care was taken to present the authorities for the readings according to as pure a text as possible. In particular Sanday availed himself of the help of Drs. Margoliouth and Headlam for the Oriental versions, which he could not himself read. It says much for the progress of New Testament textual studies in the interval that, when I came to revise the data some fifteen or twenty years later with a view to their incorporation in my critical apparatus, a good deal had to be added. At the time of publication, however, this second appendix of Sanday's was a model of accuracy, neatness, and uptodateness, and very little correction is needed even now. The third and last appendix, based on materials prepared by the two scholars just named, contains valuable information on select passages from Bohairic, Armenian and Ethiopic manuscripts. Sanday was himself an expert only in the Greek and Latin authorities, but was anxious to seek the best light from every possible source.

An admirable example of method is to be found in the appendix to Dr. White's paper in the second volume of *Studia Biblica*. It is entitled "On the Italian Origin of the Codex Amiatinus and the Localizing of Italian MSS." The investigation of orthographical peculiarities there is one of the neatest and best things Sanday ever did. The long paper in the third volume of the same collection, called "The Cheltenham List of the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament and of the Writings of Cyprian," entailed an immense amount of research and is epoch-

making.[1] Alike on canonical lists of Biblical books and Biblical and Cyprianic stichometry it is a most learned and suggestive production. This is perhaps the proper place to refer to the fact that Sanday collated the Bodleian (Douce) MS. of Primasius on the Apocalypse for Haussleiter, and lent his work on Irenæus to Von Soden for the use of his Greek Testament.

It must not be supposed from the fact that this last-mentioned work appeared in 1891 that Dr. Sanday ceased from that time to take any real interest in textual matters. That is very far indeed from being the case. His teaching work in Oxford comprised lecturing, preaching, and the conduct of two *Seminars*. The first of these *Seminars* was concerned with the study of the Gospels and the Life of Christ. It met every second Monday during term, and some idea of its value may be got from the volume issued under the leader's editorship in 1911, *Studies in the Synoptic Problem by Members of the University of Oxford*.

The second *Seminar*, which met alternately with the other, was concerned exclusively with textual matters. It was held in Dr. Sanday's dining-room, about two p.m. in the summer term, and about four p.m. in the other terms. From 1903, when I became a member of it, two subjects engaged our attention. For most of the time we were occupied with a new edition of Cyprian's "Testimonia ad Quirinum." Apart from occasional visitors who took little part in the deliberations, the members of the *Seminar* were Mr. (now Professor) C. H. Turner, Mr. (now Dean) H. J. White (till his removal to King's College, London, in 1905), and myself. As materials for our new edition we had a complete photo-

[1] He mentions there (p. 235 n.2), that he had been preparing an "Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament" for some time: this, of course, never saw the light, probably because the author did not care to enter into competition with the later editions of C. E. Hammond's book to which he contributed help.

graph of L, the Lorsch ninth-century manuscript at Vienna, collations of the Oxford and other MSS. by C. H. Turner and others, notes of the lections of the lost V(eronensis) taken from a copy of Erasmus' edition lent by Monsignor Giovanni Mercati of the Vatican Library, etc. Hartel's text and apparatus, as thus amplified and corrected, were the basis of our enquiries. We discussed all the variants at our disposal, and one member, first Mr. White, later myself, acted as scribe and copied out the text and apparatus in a stout notebook. We were not always unanimous. The Doctor was always ready to hear the views of younger scholars, and I recall many occasions on which Mr. Turner and I were on one side against Dr. Sanday; fewer where Dr. Sanday and I were against Mr. Turner, and none where each had an opinion of his own different from the others. The qualifications of the other members for such a discussion were obvious: I could claim none but a passion for Latin words and idioms. We had all the necessary Greek and Latin scripture texts, concordances, and dictionaries by our side to aid us. According to the season of the year we began with coffee or tea. The twenty-four hours a year thus passed were a very important part of my education.

The other subject was the New Testament Text of Irenæus. The foundation of this investigation was laid long before my time. Already in 1898, I think, the book was announced for publication by the Clarendon Press. Sanday had obtained fresh collations of the MSS. from the Rev. Willmore Hooper and the Rev. H. N. Bate (of Magdalen College). The New Testament quotations found in the Latin version and in the Greek original of Irenæus had been sorted out according to their Biblical order and provided with a triple critical apparatus, one for the Irenæus authorities, another for the readings of Old-Latin Biblical MSS., and a third for occasional variants from Greek Biblical

MSS. About the beginning of 1906 an appendix was printed off containing quotations that had been overlooked: most of these fresh quotations were, I think, due to Mr. Turner's consummate knowledge of the Scriptures. At the *Seminar* we revised certain portions of the book, such as the part dealing with Acts, and Mr. Turner contributed a great deal of valuable annotation on the book as a whole.

Meantime no introduction had been written, and for such a book an introduction is imperatively necessary. When Dr. Sanday obtained leave of absence from professorial duty for the year 1908–1909, he did me the honour to select me as one of his two substitutes, and in that capacity I delivered a course of lectures in the Examination Schools on the Date of the Latin Version of Irenæus and his New Testament text. The first half of these was a detailed argument of a linguistic nature, the result of which was to assign the translation, with Hort and others, to the fourth century. Hort's MS., in which he had disposed of Massuet's argument for a second-century date, was in Sanday's hands by favour of Mrs. Hort. This I copied out in a more legible hand, and read as a sort of introduction to my own work. The second part of my work was an attempt to place the text of Irenæus and the text of Irenæus' translator, so far as the New Testament quotations are concerned, in their proper place in the scheme of authorities for the New Testament text. It is no small source of pride to me that Dr. Sanday had all this material printed in 1912 as part of the introduction to the book. I understand that the material was subjected to criticism at the *Seminar* when I was no longer in Oxford, and that Dr. Sanday was also fortunate enough to obtain a chapter from Dr. Conybeare on the evidence furnished by the then recently discovered Armenian translation of Books IV. and V. of Irenæus, which chapter also he caused to be printed, as well as Mr. Turner's

notes already referred to. Meanwhile those of us that were specially interested in the matter were waiting for the short introduction which the parent of the whole work was to write. He was giving the subject deliberate consideration, and was always penitent when appealed to about it, but I doubt if anything was written at the time of his death. Professor Turner is best fitted to do this summing up, and I hope the book will not be long delayed.

It may be of interest to some to know what connexion Dr. Sanday had with the critical apparatus added to the "Revisers' Text" in 1910. Whether it was entirely of his own accord, or after consultation with his friend Dr. Fairbairn, I do not know, but about December 1903, after I had been in Oxford three months, he, as Delegate of the Press, and doubtless with the concurrence of the other Delegates, asked me to undertake the preparation of a critical apparatus to the Revisers' Text which should contain "variants important or interesting." I began with a fairly full apparatus to Romans, based on Tischendorf's eighth edition. This was submitted to him, and considerably reduced in size as the result. One feature of the book is entirely due to him, namely the Gothic symbols used to indicate versions, a feature which has been generally approved. Of course, I consulted him from time to time about difficulties. The book cost an immense amount of thought. It is hardly too much to say that the planning of it took about five or six times as long as the execution.

With regard to the *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament* the situation was entirely different. This was my own idea from the very beginning. I spoke of it in conversation to Sanday one day, but nothing was decided. Years afterwards, at a time when I thought he had forgotten all about it and I had practically given up the idea, he pressed me to take it up. He made very helpful criticisms

on the earlier proofsheets and gave advice both asked and unasked. I think he approved generally of the resultant work.

Some excuse ought to be offered for the frequent use of the first personal pronoun here. It is perhaps enough to say that Sanday was the founder of a school, and was in a very real sense the *auctor* of his pupils' productions.

A. SOUTER.

A REVOLUTION IN NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM.

A REVOLUTION, at least, in one mind: but that the most important one in Christendom in its own department; because Professor Harnack was in the opposite camp: he tested every possible alternative: and he came to his conclusions only slowly and with reluctance. In his three books — *Luke the Physician*, translation 1911. *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1909, and *Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels*, 1911 — he has fully described the process of conversion through which his mind has passed; and he himself acknowledges that it has been no less than a revolution. Notice was taken of the first of these books in the EXPOSITOR by Sir William Ramsay, and there has been occasional reference to them by other contributors, as, for example, in a recent article by Goodspeed; but their importance has failed to attract attention on account of the War. As an evidence of this may be mentioned the fact that they are not even referred to in the large lives of St. Paul published since the War by Professor David Smith and Professor McNeile.

Professor Harnack was brought up in an atmosphere in which the Tuebingen Theory was still exerting a strong influence. Though the School has passed away, the late

H. J. Holtzmann being its last prominent spokesman, yet its assumptions and presuppositions have lingered in many quarters; and Harnack acknowledges himself to have been not a little imposed upon by them. "Baur's method," he says, "is now demolished; and yet some planks of his critical structure still float upon the surface of the devastating flood." Of Baur himself, indeed, he always speaks with respect, contending that the fermentation which he set in motion in the mass of theological learning had beneficial effects. But of the less conspicuous practitioners in the same school he speaks with unfeigned annoyance or contempt, and it is with a great feeling of relief that he finds himself liberated from the spell of a tyrannical theory. It is not by any sudden impulse that his change of mind has been brought about. On the contrary, it has been the slow growth of fifteen years. In the three books themselves he is still feeling his way, and it is only in the last that he is even himself conscious of the full sweep of his conclusions. He confesses obligation to such English scholars as Ramsay and Hawkins, but not with a very good grace; because these have been actuated by apologetical considerations, while he has been purely the servant of science: the charge of partisanship in favour of the books of Scripture being the last which a German scholar will admit.

"No other book of the New Testament has," he says, "suffered so much from critics as the Acts of the Apostles. All the mistakes which have been made in New Testament criticism have been focussed" here. Even so accomplished an author as Weizsaecker he accuses of entertaining "thorough-going depreciation of, indeed, contempt for, the Acts of the Apostles." The indefensibility of the tradition that St. Luke, the companion of St. Paul, was its author "is regarded as being so clearly established that nowadays it is thought scarcely worth while to notice the

arguments of conservative opponents. Indeed, it seems that there exists a disposition to ignore the fact that such arguments exist; so quickly does criticism forget its true function, with such bigoted obstinacy does it cling to its hypotheses." Indeed, so accustomed has Harnack been himself to speak of the limitations of the author of the Acts and the mistakes with which his performance is said to abound, that he still adopts towards him a tone of freedom, or even patronage, which few in this country would be disposed to imitate. Still, the great thing is that he is conquered by the evidence for both the trustworthiness of St. Luke and the consistency of St. Paul; and he displays with great power how decisively this affects the whole criticism of the New Testament.

In the first of the three volumes, *Luke the Physician*, the author gets into close grips with the subject by examining the question, whether the author of the "we"-sections is the writer of the Book of Acts. The author of the "we"-sections was, it is allowed, a companion of St. Paul; if, then, he was the author of the whole book, he was, also, the author of the Third Gospel; and this was St. Luke.

He goes to work by analysing the "we"-sections verse by verse and word by word, comparing their language and style with the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel of St. Luke and finding them identical. This had been denied by the traditional criticism, to which the author of the Acts was a mere compiler, of very uncertain competence and even questionable honesty, who, in making use of the source known as the "we"-sections, had not even taken the trouble to alter the "wes" into "theys." At the back of this, however, was the conviction that he had misrepresented the situation and mistaken the character of St. Paul. To English readers, acquainted with the work of Hawkins, the demonstration of Harnack will occasion little surprise.

To himself, however, it was a great surprise, revolutionising his whole view of the origin of the New Testament. It is evident that it was in this demonstration of the identity of the author of the "we"-sections with St. Luke that he found salvation. He returns to the subject in the third of the volumes mentioned above, expanding the area which he examines in minute detail; but to himself the demonstration in the first volume is so convincing that he can hardly understand how any scholar can question the conclusion who has taken the trouble to look at the facts with his own eyes; though here he has to experience how slowly those who have committed themselves to critical views and identified themselves with a school can be induced to give up their prejudices.

Having thus discovered the author of the Acts to be a real man, he turns on St. Luke a close and exhaustive inquiry, discussing him as (1) a Greek, (2) a physician, (3) a companion of St. Paul, (4) a fellow-worker with St. Paul, (5) a native of Antioch. In this discussion there is not much with which the English reader is not already familiar. Hobart, an English writer, is largely quoted in proof of St. Luke's familiarity with medical terms; and here again the identity of the author of the "we"-sections with St. Luke, the author of the Gospel and the Acts, is emphasised, since this characteristic extends to all these documents. Though a physician might have been expected to be jealous of miraculous cures and the casting out of devils, St. Luke not only believed in these things but participated in them, and considered the exercise of such spiritual gifts a distinguishing mark of Christianity. Referring to an ancient tradition that St. Luke was a native of Antioch Harnack employs this to illuminate the point-of-view in the Acts, as, to the author of that book, Antioch serves as a second Jerusalem, and the tradition which guides the view of events is that

caught by the author from the atmosphere of his native city. It may be noted, in passing, that Professor David Smith, the author of the latest life of St. Paul, relying on the same tradition, understands it of the other Antioch and explains thereby the proleptic appearance, in a well-known manuscript, of the "we" at this point, St. Paul and St. Luke being supposed to have first met in Antioch-of-Pisidia.

No doubt it is largely due to Sir William Ramsay that Harnack has thus been led to identify St. Luke as a real and interesting human being. How far German scholarship is from recognising this may be illustrated by the fact that even a scholar like Wellhausen is able to suggest that the account in Acts of St. Paul's voyage to Rome may originally have been an account of the similar experience of someone else, which the author of Acts borrowed and, changing the names, introduced into his own narrative; and he makes a similar suggestion in regard to the famous account of a riot in the theatre at Ephesus. This betrays a mind living so long in a paper-world of editors and redactors as to have lost touch with the actual world. Harnack breaks away from this unreal atmosphere of the school; and, as he advances, he becomes more and more certain that he is dealing with actual facts. In lives of St. Paul written in English it is a rare thing to miss admiration for either St. Paul, the man and the apostle, or St. Luke, the author; but in German books this kind of affection has generally been conspicuously absent; and no wonder, when such a number of literary phantoms were interposed between the reader and the text. But Harnack has recovered, in no inconsiderable degree, the natural relation to both the hero of the Acts and his biographer.

In the second of the volumes mentioned above Harnack,

in a preface of forty pages, writes a literary essay on the plan and the execution of the Book of Acts, and here he is at his very best. When writing his Gospel, St. Luke had the great advantage of going over ground which others had traversed before him; but, when writing the Acts, he was the pioneer; and, besides, the material was much less tractable and consistent. He had to deal, not with a single life, as in the Gospel, but with a movement, breaking out in many places and in many forms, yet issuing in a grand unit—the formation of the Christian Church. He had, indeed, the lives of St. Peter and St. Paul to guide him to a certain extent; but, between these, there were other figures, like Stephen and Philip, to put in their own places; and there was the genius of Christianity itself, pushing forward toward the conquest of the world. It is singular that the mission to the Gentiles was not an inspiration of either St. Peter or St. Paul, but a joint result of tendencies latent in the new religion itself and manifesting themselves first in obscure personages of the drama. This is the plan of the Acts "to show how the power of the Spirit of Jesus in the Apostles founded the Primitive Community, called into being the mission to the Gentiles, conducted the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome, and set the receptive Gentile world in the place of the Jewish nation, which hardened its heart more and more against the appeal of Christianity." Instead of being a thing of shreds and patches, as the critics have made it out to be, the Book of Acts has a marvellous unity, in which the plastic skill of a Gentile unites with the devout faith of a Jewish proselyte to show the rise of Christianity as the work of God. Not only, however, is the book in itself a unity, but it is united with the Gospel, and, in his preface, St. Luke indicates that, in his eyes, it is the same Jesus Christ who has been living and moving in Palestine

as the hero of the one book who is energising in the vast world of the other. To this view of St. Luke's literary accomplishment Harnack has returned in a volume not yet translated into English on the origin of Christianity (*Die Entstehung des neuen Testaments*, 1914), claiming that, by forming a bridge between "Gospel" and "Apostle," St. Luke created the conception of Christianity and made possible a New Testament. Even in regard to style, Harnack maintains, St. Luke is a master of language, and his work can be compared with the best literary productions of the Hellenico-Roman period.

In the work which follows this preface Harnack submits the Book of Acts to a searching examination as regards (1) chronological data; (2) lands, nations, cities and houses; (3) the treatment of persons; (4) miracles and works of the Spirit. This is with the view of showing how close is the touch of the author with fact and how firm is his tread on the solid ground of reality. All along, too, the proof, published in the first volume, that the author of the "we"-sections and the author of the entire book are identical, is kept in view, and additional evidence noted. Thus, the very way in which the word "Jerusalem" is spelt in the "we"-sections, the rest of the Acts and the Gospel of St. Luke, differing in this respect from the other New Testament writings, would by itself prove that the author of all three was the same.

But, in the course of this investigation, we come upon one of the most formidable obstacles to the thesis which the author is maintaining. This is the account of the Council at Jerusalem, with the decree issued to the Gentile Churches, in the fifteenth chapter. This, it is claimed, is quite inconsistent with the autobiographical statements in the Epistle to the Galatians; and it attributes to St. Paul conduct which none acquainted with his real con-

victions could have associated with him. Everyone is aware how great is the difficulty of understanding how, in Galatians, St. Paul could have defended his own conduct without quoting the acknowledgment which it had received from all the apostles at the Council of Jerusalem, and it is no less difficult to understand how, not only St. Paul but anyone, could, in the decree sent to the Gentile converts, have placed the eating of things strangled and fornication on the same level. It is well known that the Apostolic Decree is handed down in a twofold form in the manuscripts and by the Fathers; and Harnack adopts the bold course of deleting the word for "things strangled" altogether. Then, "meats offered to idols" would refer not to the purchase and use of flesh that had been employed in heathen sacrifices, but to idolatry itself and participation in the idol feasts; and, in the same way, "blood" would refer not to the eating of flesh killed with the blood, but to murder. With "things strangled" thus struck out, the three things forbidden by the Council would be idolatry, homicide and fornication—the primary demands of Christian morality—and, if it should be thought that these came too low down to be embodied in a decree addressed to young Christians in the first fervour of faith, Harnack is able to quote from Revelation xxii. 15: "Without are whoremongers and murderers and idolaters," the same three sins being condemned. If, however, the message of the Council to the Churches only forbade these things, it was not necessary for St. Paul, in Galatians, to quote the authority of the Council for such solemn but elementary demands, in which of course he acquiesced.

Whether this somewhat high-handed way of cutting the knot can be justified, it is for experts in textual criticism to decide; and I do not venture to give an opinion. But there is another way out of the difficulty, or at least part

of the difficulty. When, in Galatians, St. Paul approaches the date of the Council at Jerusalem and seems on the point of clinching his argument by quoting the Apostolic Decree and explaining his conduct in consenting to the imposition of certain Jewish ceremonial regulations on his Gentile converts, but stops short and fails to refer to the Council at all, the easiest explanation would be that the Epistle to the Galatians was written before the Council was held. And this solution, which has been resorted to by Sir William Ramsay, is by degrees slowly winning the assent of scholars.

As there elapsed a considerable interval between the publication of the second and that of the third of the volumes mentioned above, the author was able, in the latter, to reply to some of the objections called forth by the earlier volumes, as well as to acknowledge the contributions of certain authors who had advanced more rapidly than himself in drawing the conclusions implied in the earlier volumes. But he himself was continuing his investigations and moving with slow but firm steps towards the position on which he has now taken his stand. The opening passages especially of the third volume are among the profoundest and most original which Harnack has ever written.

The least credible things in the Book of Acts, according to the current criticism, are the concessions to Jewish sentiment which St. Paul is reported to have made from time to time, and especially the one which he was advised by the local apostles to make, for the sake of conciliating the Jews, when he arrived in Jerusalem at the close of the Third Missionary Journey. That St. Paul, the abolisher of the Law, should have joined with Jewish devotees in the performance of a Nazirite vow is as little to be believed as would be a report that one of the Reformers had in his

old age presented a garland to our Lady. Justification by faith alone is the watchword of Protestantism; St. Paul was the apostle of this dogma; and the Protestant conscience is tender towards any infringement of his loyalty to his own creed. In their zeal, however, Protestant critics have anticipated the progress of conviction, attributing to St. Paul sentiments which did not mature till the time of Justin Martyr. To Justin not only is the Mosaic Law abolished, but it is sinful apostasy to observe it; all the promises made to the Jews now refer only to the new people of the Christians; Jewish Christians who still observe the Law are not Christians, but Jews. Perhaps this was in accordance with the logic of the situation, justification by faith alone permitting of no difference in the sight of God between one human being and another on the one hand and one Christian and another on the other. But the recognition of such absolute equality was a slow process, and St. Paul himself was far from being disentangled from the prejudices of his birth and upbringing. Not only did he himself, in his ordinary life, observe the Jewish customs and, at the sacred seasons, travel great distances in order to take part in the Jewish worship at Jerusalem, believing this to be permitted or enjoined by the fact that he was a born Jew, but he taught and encouraged born Jews everywhere, after they became Christians, to follow the same course. As regards such things, everyone was, in his opinion, to adhere to the custom in which he had been born. By a masterly analysis, however, of the three chapters in the latter half of Romans where St. Paul works out his deepest thoughts about the relation to God and history of the covenant people, Harnack shows how complicated in St. Paul's own mind was the relation between himself and his people. St. Paul, in short, was less Pauline or Protestant than have been some of his

interpreters. Not only was he ready to sacrifice his own salvation for the salvation of his beloved people, but the Gentiles could get to God and His salvation only through the Jewish people, as the wild olive-tree could not secure adhesion to the plant except through engrafting on the natural branch; and, while the new Israel became heirs of the promises because of their faith in Christ, yet the promises were still, in a sense, the property of the Jewish people, because "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance."

It is no wonder that one who entertained sentiments like these should have been misunderstood or that opponents should have accused him of glaring inconsistency. But neither is it any wonder that, in response to the recommendation of the other apostles and for the sake of winning for his Gospel the assent of those with whom he felt himself to be thus one, though they repudiated the connexion, he should have agreed to compromise, not through cowardice or double dealing, but from far deeper motives, lying at the bottom of his conviction and personality. Harnack, therefore, accepts the narrative of the Acts, at this critical point, as genuine history and sees no reason why it may not have been written down by a friend and companion of the Apostle.

There are other features of St. Paul's career, at this stage, which cannot be understood unless it be remembered that we are dealing with a complex and original personality. There is especially the circumstance that, when proceeding towards Jerusalem at the close of the Third Missionary Journey, he was warned by prophecy in every city containing Christians through which he passed, that he would be arrested and imprisoned at Jerusalem, and nevertheless persevered in holding on towards the goal of his journey, apparently in the hope that, through some peculiar inter-

position of the Spirit of God, he might be the means of leading the whole Jewish nation into the Kingdom of Christ. He believed these warnings to be inspired by the Spirit of prophecy, and yet he disregarded them and went forward. At Miletus he went so far as to forewarn his Ephesian disciples that they should see his face no more; but in the circumstances it seems to be doubtful whether this can be looked upon as a prophecy certain to be fulfilled.

The critical view is, that this was an actual prophecy, and that it was fulfilled through the Apostle being condemned and executed when he reached Rome. This, however, has against it the strong tradition of antiquity, that he was acquitted at his first trial and released from prison, resuming his apostolic activity and revisiting his Asiatic churches, in spite of the foreboding to the contrary expressed by himself at Miletus. As is well known, the Pastoral Epistles are the monument of this period in the Apostle's history, the last of these being penned during a later imprisonment, from which he did not escape except by the gateway of martyrdom; and, though this be the most contested portion of St. Paul's literary bequest, there is nothing in the Book of Acts to preclude the possibility of St. Paul having penned these final writings.

If the first Roman imprisonment ended with condemnation and martyrdom, and if the Book of Acts was written long afterwards, why did not the author describe the final scenes and make the martyrdom the glorious conclusion of the book? From the date of St. Paul's appeal to the Emperor the narrator had given almost disproportionate space to legal details and to the appearances of the hero before principalities and powers; in the account of St. Stephen he had shown what he could make of a martyrdom; why, then, when his readers had been put on the strain to know the fate of the hero, did he miss the grand opportunity?

The answer given to this difficulty is that the plan of the work excluded it, the design being only to tell how the Gospel, starting from Jerusalem, ultimately made its way to Rome, the capital of the world; though such an exact limit is not suggested, but rather the reverse, by the eighth verse of the first chapter, from which the notion is taken. For many years, Harnack confesses, he was content to "soothe his intellectual conscience" with such expedients. "But," he goes on, "they altogether transgress against inward probability and all the psychological laws of historical composition. The more clearly we see that the trial of St. Paul, and above all his appeal to Cæsar, is the chief subject of the last quarter of the Acts, the more hopeless does it appear that we can explain why the narrative breaks off as it does, otherwise than by assuming that the trial had actually not yet reached its close. It is no use to struggle against this conclusion. If St. Luke, in the year 80, 90 or 100, wrote thus, he was not simply a blundering but an absolutely incomprehensible historian." He adduces other reasons, both negative and positive, that the book was written immediately after the last incidents narrated in it—especially the fact that the Destruction of Jerusalem is never referred to, though great prominence is given to the guilt of the Jews in rejecting and opposing Christianity, of which the loss of their capital might have been represented as the penalty but he comes back to the circumstance which has carried him away with irresistible force; and he states his conclusion in these terms: "The concluding verses of the Acts of the Apostles, taken in conjunction with the absence of any reference in the book to the result of the trial of St. Paul and to his martyrdom, make it in the highest degree probable that the work was written at the time when St. Paul's trial in Rome had not yet come to an end."

Such a rehabilitation of a single book of Scripture, proceeding from such a quarter and as a result of such prolonged and conscientious investigation, is significant; yet it is far less so than the inferences which it involves for other books of the New Testament. These furnish the justification for characterising the above writings of Harnack as a revolution in New Testament criticism.

First, if St. Luke was the author of the Acts and wrote this book before the Destruction of Jerusalem, then the Gospel of St. Luke, to which the Book of Acts is obviously a sequel, was of still earlier date. That this consequence was involved was one of the principal reasons against the early dating of the Acts. A late date for the Gospel formed part of the Tuebingen construction of the New Testament writings; and so much had it become a thing of course that even Zahn took it for granted. On looking closely into the matter, however, Harnack finds the reasons very flimsy. They amount to nothing more than that the Gospel must have been written after the Destruction of Jerusalem, because the predictions of this event put into the mouth of Jesus are too precise to have been actually uttered by Him. It is clear, however, that it is very difficult to determine how closely such a prediction from the mouth of Jesus may have come to the facts, and that in judging of this problem there is ample room for subjective bias. After close examination, Harnack finds nothing to cause alarm and dismisses the bogey as part of the stock in-trade of a bygone stage of criticism. Secondly, if the Gospel of St. Luke was written earlier than the Acts, the Gospel of St. Mark was written earlier still; because St. Luke excerpts from it so abundantly. Thirdly, as for the Gospel of St. Matthew, Harnack refrains from a very positive statement, because he believes that this Gospel exhibits more interpolation than any other, some of which may have been of later composition, but, on the whole,

St. Matthew also is older than the Acts and was composed before the Destruction of Jerusalem, as was, also, of course the Source from which both St. Matthew and St. Mark borrowed.

In the first of the three books named at the opening of this article, Harnack mentions the year 80 as about the date of the Book of Acts; in the second he argues strongly yet tentatively for a date in the first half of the seventh Christian decade; in the third he specifies the year 62 as the most probable: St. Luke's Gospel being assigned to the year 60 at latest, and St. Mark's remitted to the sixth decade.

What effect these studies in the New Testament will have in the author's own country, time will be required to show. It is best that, when such questions as are here raised are being settled, the decisions should be due not to the authority of names, but to the facts of the case. The revolt, however, of a great name may have a wholesome influence when prejudices of long standing require to be broken up. When it is remembered with what confidence the Tuebingen views were at one time maintained and with what tyranny they were imposed on youthful scholars, these papers may be looked upon as part of a great movement in New Testament criticism back to sanity and faith: and it may be the precursor of a movement, much needed, of the same kind in Old Testament criticism. In Great Britain and America it has happened more than once that opinions have been given forth as the last word in German wisdom when their authority had already begun to falter in the country of their origin; and it will be well for students in the English-speaking countries to know that works on New Testament Introduction, like those of Moffatt and Bacon, do not represent the latest or maturest developments of even Continental

opinion. The most gratifying aspect of the case, however, lies in the nearness with which such criticism as that of Harnack is bringing us to the great central Figure of the Gospel, and the constantly diminishing area within the New Testament to which reasonable doubt can still be said to attach.

JAMES STALKER.

THE BEGINNING OF THE LAST ACTION.

A STUDY OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL, CHAPTER XI.

WITH this section the Evangelist brings Jesus into the circle of the Cross; with the entrance into Jerusalem the story becomes charged with destiny: the scale changes at this point: the speed of the narrative slackens, as though the drama has reached the crisis towards which it has moved swiftly. There is no conscious art, but for that very reason the impression is the clearer. The days stand out one by one in the deepened light of the Cross; and in his own wonderful and even unconscious way the Evangelist suggests the change not only in the other actors, but in the Lord Himself.

In this one chapter there are five episodes, each of which brings out the character of His action as He takes the first steps into the narrowing area of His Passion. These episodes are the entry into Jerusalem; the Cursing of the Fig-Tree; the Cleansing of the Temple; the Discourse upon Faith; and the First Direct Encounter with the Religious Leaders of the City. How then do these narratives reveal the mind of Christ? Do they give a picture of the Saviour with the same look on His face?

The entry into Jerusalem shows at once that He had come to the city not to await events but to control them. It is the action of One who takes the field Himself with a fearless

mind. He is active, not passive, before all other things; His confidence must strike the reader: He is the knight riding up to the citadel, certain that He will fall, but never doubting that out of defeat and shame and death He will snatch an eternal victory. Before the first clash He claims the victory.

It is true that He enters not as conquerors had entered in other days with the panoply of war. He shows the character of His kingdom in the emblems which He chooses. He rides upon an ass. But no one can miss in the narrative the princely bearing of Jesus. A King of peace, but even more a King for that reason!

This entry is a symbolic action such as One, who knew and shared the prophetic tradition, would find His most natural expression. It is hard for the modern Western mind to grasp the occasion for such a dramatic action. Words are for us the chosen vehicle of communication from mind to mind. In the East action has always been and still is the more natural language. We have discovered its value in the education of children; perhaps when we have become as children, and entered into the Kingdom of Heaven we shall use symbolic action more. But now when we find such a method used, as it was by Plimsoll in the House of Commons, we are bewildered, and if we are impressed, it is almost in spite of ourselves. Is it not clear from the story that the Saviour in this hour of solemn destiny set forth the exaltation of His spirit in action not in words? It is often the only way in which the spirit within can find an outlet. There was in the Saviour something which would not go into words. There was a fire burning in His bones, and He could not contain. Words could not speak all His mind. *He must do things.*

There is at once in His mind the foreboding of death, and the certainty that He holds the future in His hands. As

the last of the prophets—for though He was more than a prophet, He was still a prophet—He had come into the inheritance of failure which all the prophets had known, and Israel itself had tasted from one age to another. Its story had been one of almost unbroken failure. Even the prophets had spent their strength, so it seemed, for nought. Jesus had no illusions: He was to taste their cup, and how much more! His hour of darkness was near. Which of the prophets perished outside Jerusalem? Yet in such an hour He showed His mastery. "Tragic foresight and assured spiritual strength" are blended in Him. This is made clear in the story. But if he is to see this the eye of the reader must be turned not to the faces in the crowd, but to the face of the King, riding upon an ass into the city.

The story of the Fig Tree raises many critical questions. It has been thought by many to be one of two versions of the same thing: Luke gives the parable, Mark the same teaching in the form of the acted sign. For the purpose of this study it can be claimed that the tremendous and destructive energy revealed in the story is not out of keeping with the other revelations of Jesus which accompany it. If He is pictured as a passive being, allowing Himself to be led, if He is understood to be but a "lamb led to the slaughter," and the very name of "lord" is but a deferential title, then it will seem strange to read of such words or deeds as follow —of mountains hurled and trees blasted. But if it is clearly seen that in Jesus there entered the city an energy hitherto held back and now released in its full might, and if He is come "with His fan in His hand to cleanse His threshing-floor," it will not be altogether strange to read how He dealt with the fig tree. The narrative reflects at least an impression left upon the disciple circle. Jesus remained in their memories of that time as the wielder of fierce and terrible powers. He was driven by the Spirit. It never

seemed inconceivable to those who had known Him in those days that such a Being should make the very trees serve His ends. He passed like a gale over the souls of men. The story is true to the character of the Messiah in those days of crisis. Those who would recover the Jesus of the earliest tradition will do well to ask this question at least—what manner of Being was He of whom such a story could be told by His friends without any sense of incongruity? There are some versions of Jesus of which it could be said without hesitation not only that He could never have blasted a fig-tree, but that no one could ever have imagined that He did.

According to this Gospel on the first evening when Jesus had come to the Temple, "He looked round about Him upon all things." It was not till the next day that He went into the Temple and began to cast out them that sold and bought in the Temple. The delay in the action is important; Jesus did not cleanse the Temple at once; He saw the scene, and went out of the city perhaps to "sleep over it," or more probably "to watch and pray" over it. The first thing He had to do was to visit the familiar place and to see clearly what was its condition. The Messiah-Judge entered the house which was to be the scene of much of His ministry that week. He was a general going over the ground carefully the night before the action was to begin. Luke and Matthew omit this reference, and show Christ hastening at once to cleanse the Temple. It may be because of this omission that certain critics have exaggerated the suddenness of the cleansing of the Temple, and have suspected an element of instability in the Saviour. But if Mark is to be followed, the passion of the Saviour was held in check. He took time to reflect. He was not carried away by His passion. He was Master. But this picture of Jesus looking round upon all things does not correct the other impressions of His character left by this section; it is not as though the

passive and waiting Jesus were contrasted here with the active and passionate Jesus. There is nothing which reveals the power of the Judge more than the story of His visit to the Temple that He might take in all the facts and measure His foe. He makes a pause in the action; but in this He is revealed all the more clearly as Master of the action. The power and the wrath are held in reserve; but they are always there.

When on the next day He cleansed the Temple, the act seemed sudden to the spectators, but He had come deliberately to do this thing. It was His defiance of the Temple authorities; but the act was not a mere flinging down of the gauntlet. Its precise character must be borne in mind. It had a definite bearing upon the Messianic office of Jesus. Here He came in judgment to His own Father's House. He came to the Temple in the spirit of the words in the prophet Malachi: "And the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His Temple. He shall purify the sons of Levi." Or He may have had in mind the words of Zechariah, "In that day there shall be no longer any merchants in the House of God"; into a part left open by the prophets He stepped. Not as an iconoclast, but as a devout son of Israel, He came to the Temple. It was not the Temple that kindled His wrath, but the profanation of the Temple. In time to come the Temple would be left with not one stone standing upon another, but meanwhile for that House He had a deep and holy reverence; and He saw it a den of robbers.

But this act of pious love was at the same time a defiance of the Temple authorities. They were wounded where they were most vulnerable—in their love of gain. In seeking for the historic cause of the death of Jesus it is uncritical to ignore this act. What the authorities and others alleged is no guide to their real motives. They may have called out "blasphemy" when all that they meant was "our money

is in danger." "Financial considerations," Dr. Kirsopp Lake has said, "rather than theological hatred were the real cause of the accusation of the priests, though they dressed it up in a partly political, partly religious form." There is not enough to show that this was the only cause, but it is clear that it was one cause of the implacable hatred which Jesus met that week.

For its light upon the mind of Jesus the story is of first-rate importance. It reveals Him again acting in symbol. In one act of judgment He shows the manner of His judgment in ten thousand acts. Soon men will be judging Him; but He is first. He sweeps into the Temple with His scourge of judgment, the One who is to judge the nations and who will begin there at the centre of human life. The real judgment is concentrated upon the spiritual side of man's life. It begins with the House of God. There the secret of man is revealed. What has he made of the gifts which have come to him as a spiritual being? Christ began not with the State, but with the Church, for it is by His handling of the truth of God that man is judged. The one sin which meets the full tide of the Master's wrath is the perversion of holy things to base usage.

There is no escape in the story from the evidence of wrath. It is not instability or passion let loose beyond control which is manifested, but it is wrath—the reaction of a holy love against sin. Christ is not using an abuse in the courts of the Temple as an occasion for declaring war against His foes; He strikes at the heart of all the evil in that city. The wrong did not lie in the gross vices of the city, nor at the last resort in the cowardice or worldliness of its rulers; it lay in their irreverent and dishonest treatment of the trust which had been committed by God to them. They were guilty of a breach of trust—fraudulent executors of a covenant. That is why the Messiah must begin with the Temple.

There He measured His enemies; there in the spirit of the warrior He had struck at them and struck hard. They would prevail over Him at the moment; but knowing His own certain overthrow He bore Himself as their Judge. In Him all the prophets lived again; their failure was to be crowned by His failure: their failure was to be vindicated in His ultimate victory. The scene in the Temple shows in Jesus still the same passion and the same confidence. Eager, active, fearless, free from all uncertainty, He is made to pass before us. The Son of Man is Lord also of the Temple.

It is the same Jesus who speaks of faith and its powers. He had spoken often of faith in quieter days, now in the press of the storm He declares the same truth in words, which are themselves deeds. He is dwelling still in the realm of action; mountains may be torn up by the roots and cast into the sea! There lies the secret upon which He has pledged His life. He speaks of revolutions to be wrought in the human scene; for Him faith means the energy that overthrows all that stands in its way. He is like One who is using a certain power, the properties of which others scarcely guess; He knows; day by day He is living in a world where changes are wrought; in Him are pulsing all the powers of the age to come. Others might have the same forces. With these He means to meet the enemy. On the one hand are all the entrenched powers—Sadducees and Pharisees; on the other faith with its revolutions! But that is enough. It is not of

> "the silence of eternity
> Interpreted by love"

that He thinks, but of the powers of the eternal Lord released by faith.

In the last episode in the chapter there is the record of the encounter between Jesus and His foes. They demand

of Him by what kind of authority He acts. It is their first move against Him; it is a characteristic piece of ecclesiastical warfare. The real issue is evaded: an attempt is made to browbeat the peasant. The brilliant intellectuals of Jerusalem treat Jesus as the priests treated Amos. But the story reveals the quick penetrating intellect of Jesus. He is in this story the master-mind. He does not submit to these men, He takes the field against them, and controls the conflict.

"By what kind of authority!" Who were they to put the question? What had their past to show? They had had to face the same question before; what answer had they given? The baptism of John—whence was it? The question was a reference to the back numbers of their history not as dialecticians but as moral beings with a choice to make. Their character stood out nakedly revealed. They were talking of "authority," but the only authority which they had acknowledged was their own personal interests. So they were ruled out of all rightful place in a conversation upon authority. With these His foes the Master did not hesitate to close; in them He saw the great forces against Him, the fatal duplicity of the human heart; its self-seeking; its hatred of the truth; its incapacity to distinguish truth, because of its unwillingness to follow truth.

On the one hand a faith which can remove mountains; on the other hand the blindness which cannot see God! The clash begins; Jesus must lose according to the judgment of the world. His faith will break in vain against such a pervasive disease of the will; but there can be only one end. Jesus we watch as He moves with His quick intellect and His unwearied passion of love into the conflict. All His powers are called into action. This is the Lord revealed in the opening of the last act. Calm even while all His emo-

tional life is at its highest tension; regnant with all His powers raised to their highest, deeply stirred yet almost master of Himself; quick to see through the mists of the battle; reckoning without illusion the forces against Him and for Him; prepared for the last darkness, yet in the very hour of failure confident that He will bring in the kingdom. This is He, to whom with far more wonder in our voices we may cry

"Hosanna in the highest!
Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord!"

EDWARD SHILLITO.

THE VITAL INTEREST OF THE CHURCH IN PURE DOCTRINE.

IT is assumed for the purposes of this brief paper that the Church, whatever more it be, is the visibly organised society of believers, which is able in some real and effective way to give expression to its living interest in truth.

It is assumed, likewise, that by doctrine we properly mean not dogma formulated and imposed by authority, or again the scientifically articulated system of theology, but simply the vital Christian convictions. This is said without prejudice to what may be the right or duty of the Church to put its faith in the form of a Creed to be subscribed by its office-bearers. Doctrine then is the equivalent of the fundamental Christian convictions, and it is plain that the official Creed may contain matter over and above these. As exemplifying the meaning attached here to "fundamental Christian beliefs," reference may be made to the "Declaration of Membership" adopted by the Student Christian Movement, and to Principal Denney's proposed Creed (in *Jesus and the Gospel*). And we have

to ask wherein lies the essential stake of the Church in having these beliefs purely preserved and declared.

The interest of the Church in doctrine may undoubtedly be distinguished from that of the individual believer. In the New Testament, the Church rather than the individual is represented as having been put in trust with the Gospel, as it is the society, not the individual, that celebrates the Sacraments. Much modern feeling tends to exaggerate the true individualism of Christianity, and to forget that Divine grace invariably reaches men through the mediation of the Church's evangelism, nurture and fellowship. It is the believing society, which never dies, that has received the saving Word of God to be the nourishment of its own life and to be imparted unceasingly to the world. After the Reformation the Church was declared to be "the congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught, and the Sacraments rightly administered." Everywhere in the Creeds of the Reformed Churches, the preaching of the pure Word is referred to as a corporate obligation, performed within a society and in the society's name; it is a "note" whereby the true Church may be identified.

The possession and the promulgation of a pure Gospel is universally recognised to-day as a constitutive mark of the Church. Often this is done quite apart from theory. Thus, *apropos* of some "reduced" form of Christology, one may hear it said: "It may suffice for an individual, but the Church could not subsist upon it." Probably by this is meant that the individual Christian never is really isolated; he lives, by necessity, in the midst of the Church and is (often unconsciously) nourished and inspired by its richer faith. Whereas the Church has, and must have, its Spirit-bestowed resources within itself: there is no larger body from which *it* may draw. Further, the Church at any given moment is but a cross-section of the Christian genera-

tions ; it is what it is because of the Gospel it has inherited, and of that Gospel it is trustee for the future. It is called upon to pass down the heritage unimpaired. The fulfilment of this obligation, however, must not be identified with the maintenance of unchanging credal formulas. It is conceivable that change in formulation may record a deep appreciation of the Gospel.

Again, the individual believer may suspend judgment upon this or that article of faith ; but by suspense of judgment he implicitly acknowledges that the society may be in possession of truth to which, as yet, his eyes have not opened. It is impossible and forbidden for the Church to deal with its Creed so summarily as the individual may do. For the Church consists of many minds, and, honesty of conviction in all cases being assumed, it would be wrong to introduce modifications in the Creed until the majority of those who constitute the Church had been convinced of the rightness of the change.

Differences of an important kind exist between the Roman and the Protestant conceptions of the Church's relation to doctrine, but it ought to be noted that all Churches claiming to be Christian believe themselves to be in possession of eternal and unchangeable truth. For all are built upon convictions. No Church can even admit that possibly or probably it is radically in error, so that a wiser posterity may overturn its creed. But in the case of Rome, this well-grounded confidence that the Church has all along kept hold of the essentials of the Gospel becomes the dogma of absolute and universal infallibility ; the Church has no duty towards Divine truth which it has not discharged, for "it teaches nothing new, and nothing but what is true, and what it teaches must have been delivered by Christ and His Apostles." When doctrinal pronouncements are requisite to define some point of faith or morals, they are made by an individual

in whom the infallibility of the Church is concentrated, but in such wise that his definitions do not take their rise in the consent of the Church, or derive from that consent any portion of their authority. The Churches of the Reformation, on the other hand, find the supreme norm of doctrine in the Scriptures interpreted by the guidance of the Spirit of Christ. They accept the glories, if also the dangers, of Christian liberty.

All Churches hold that the believing society is called upon (1) to proclaim the truths of the Gospel, (2) to defend them, whether against hostile outsiders or against the erroneous interpretations of its own members. That this duty may be the more effectively performed, the Church has provided for the expert study of theology, and by doing so has implicitly recognised that as time goes on the Gospel may come to be better understood. The endeavour to explain more lucidly and convincingly what the Gospel means, and to adjust the explanation to changing modes of secular thought, ought to make the Church's mind a progressive mind, and has done so, though to a disappointingly slight extent. Good doctrine is requisite to expel bad. Every Christian necessarily cherishes a view of what the Christian religion is, its essence and its implications; this view is often partially out of line with the New Testament; hence one vital interest of the Church is to imbue Christian people with such a conception of the meaning of Christ as will preserve them from less worthy modes of thinking, draw them closer together, and furnish a more fruitful basis of practical co-operation.

The Church's teaching cannot but possess, for its own members, the character of spiritual (not legal or external) authority. In a deep and commanding sense Christians owe allegiance to it. Our knowledge of God has come to us through the Church (of which the family is an organic

part), not from abstract reasoning or immediate intuition. Therefore the constraining weight of the Church's religious witness is such that to ignore it would be blind and thankless. And the individual who has thus far failed to discover value in an article of the hereditary creed is bound to ask himself which is more probable : that his denial is mistaken, or that the Church in all generations has seen something where in reality there is nothing to see.

The sole instrument possessed by the Church whereby to change men into Christ's image is truth—whether spoken orally, or presented sacramentally, or expressed in holy lives. Souls can be won and regenerated only by being convinced of truth. The Church, accordingly, is concerned to use this instrument in accordance with its proper nature, i.e. not by way of intellectual compulsion, but as appealing to the whole man, mind, conscience and heart. It will declare truth with authority—the authority of conviction generated by the redeeming experience of Christ, and evidencing itself purely by the light of its own meaning. And it is on the same terms that its authority will be recognised, in free and spontaneous assent.

We cannot reflect upon the authority of the Church in matters of religious truth—an authority it is bound to exert to the uttermost—without becoming aware of difficulties on the right hand and the left. For one thing, as Hatch says, in every society it is the average man that rules, and the average Christian mind may fail to appreciate the highest forms of truth, may fail also to expect new truth continually to break forth from the Word of God. Again, the authority of the Church ought not to be used to cover statements of a purely theoretic character : we cannot forget that every great Creed has really been the work of experts, of a special class of educated men, working in the atmosphere of a particular age. None the less, the believing witness of

the Church on matters of faith and devotion—on the Gospel and the life inspired by the Gospel—will always rank as almost irresistibly impressive. Instinct declares that the Gospel, if such there be, is something which the common Christian mind can apprehend, and of which it can give itself a true account. It is part of faith to believe that the Word of God will always create a society in which the great convictions it generates are carried forward.

As a reason for denying the religious authority of the Church, it may be urged that in the past the Church has frequently been not merely the victim, but the patron, of falsehood. It has opposed reformers, and has erred both in morality and doctrine. When, however, its authority is thus repudiated in the name of conscience it may be pointed out that conscience itself has often erred. Yet we reverence its imperatives and find an august authority in its ideals. Similarly, the fundamental convictions of "the holy Church throughout all the world" must always exert a constraining force.[1]

It may be objected that, in what has been said above regarding the Church's interest in pure doctrine and the authority of believing witness with which she enforces it, no exact distinction has been made between purely religious truth and dogmatic interpretation. This is true: no such distinction can ever be made. It does not appear to be necessary. For, as Burke observes, "though no man can draw a stroke between the confines of day and night, yet light and darkness are upon the whole tolerably distinguishable." The invasion of technical theological terms can usually be detected without difficulty, and these terms cannot legitimately be covered by the authority of believing witness.

If the Church, then, has a vital interest in the pure

[1] Cf. Leckie, *Authority in Religion.*

teaching of the Gospel, the question arises how best the Church may ensure that this its interest is understood and respected. It is impossible to insist on absolute uniformity of belief. No group of men can hold absolutely identical beliefs in the sense that each member of the group attaches precisely the same meaning to all terms employed in propositions to which all give assent. What is more, differences may be of such a kind as to signalise deeper unity. Thus the Christologies of the New Testament are in many ways different, while the attitude of all the writers to Christ, as Lord and Saviour, is the same. There are differences of belief, accordingly, which do not abrogate Christian brotherhood. But the Church cannot agree to consider every kind of difference as unessential. The line marking off fundamental from non-fundamental doctrines may be placed at varying points, but every communion draws the line somewhere. And this involves the claim to exercise ecclesiastical discipline in matters of religious belief.

Instantly it becomes obvious that an antinomy of motive exists at this point. On the one hand, the Church must see to it that the pure Gospel is preached and taught; on the other, it must secure truthful men to preach it. We need not raise at this point the difficult question whether more in the way of creed-subscription ought to be demanded from ministers than from ordinary communicating members; enough to say that the Church has always felt it its duty to ascertain that those whom it puts in places of responsibility —and nothing can be more responsible than preaching— are really in essential agreement with its faith. These men preach in the Church's name; they represent it; and congregations are entitled to claim protection against teachers who teach what is not Christian truth. The Church is not a debating society or an ethical association; it is a society *sui generis* called into being by Christ for purposes

of His own, and the preacher is a witness and mouthpiece of the common faith by which the Church lives. On the other hand, the preacher derives his knowledge of the Gospel from Scripture, and is bound to deepen and enrich that knowledge by employing the best and most scientific methods of Scripture interpretation. He must hold himself free to accept new truth.

The antinomy is not one which can be resolved solely by law or logic, or by any method which does not express trust in the Holy Spirit promised by Christ as well as in the conscience and goodwill of those who have dedicated their lives to the office of preaching. How is this to be combined with consideration for the right of the Christian people to be taught the pure Gospel and the duty of the Church to provide for the propagation of the faith on which its own existence rests? That is a question on which we cannot enter now. It must suffice to say that what the Church as a spiritual body must seek from its teaching representatives is not a legal assurance of orthodoxy but a moral assurance that they share the immemorial faith of the saints in God as personally present in Christ for our salvation. To some minds it will seem most natural that ministers should subscribe an old Creed interpreted in its spirit rather than in its letter; others will prefer the making of a new Creed. There is always a danger, however, that a new Creed may be held as *verbally* binding, and old difficulties thus re-emerge in intensified form.

It is important to point out that the Church's interest in pure doctrine is not to be met by the method of what is really spurious simplification. Thus it has been suggested that Churches should unite on the basis of the Nicene Creed alone. But—and this at once impresses us when we compare it with the great Confessions of the Reformation—the Nicene Creed says not a word of justification, adoption,

and sanctification ; of saving faith and repentance unto life ; of Christian liberty and liberty of conscience ; of the social implications of Christianity ; of Holy Scripture and the means of grace. And all these are matters which can be verified in experience. If the Church's supreme duty is to express and diffuse its prophetic knowledge of God, it must do so above all by proclaiming the great thoughts about God which are inspired by the experience of Christ. No *legal* guarantee of unchanging orthodoxy can be given. But the vital impulse of the Church to learn the mind of Christ ever more perfectly must be trusted to realise itself. We have the promise of the Spirit, to lead believers into all truth ; we have the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever, and to which the Spirit bears witness perpetually in the hearts of men. These are the real—these, when we speak strictly, are the only and the sufficient—guarantees that the mind of the Church, working freely on its data, will reach conclusions that are in line with the faith of the past. Wherever sincere men are impressed by Christ as those were impressed who gathered round Him at the beginning, there the truth will be.

H. R. Mackintosh.

NOTES ON THE PAPER "THE PHILOLOGY OF ST. LUKE'S PREFACE."

Πληροφορεῖν *in New Testament.*

2 Tim. iv. 17 : ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα πληροφορηθῇ "come to its full yield"; cp. Col. i. 5 f. (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστιν καρποφορούμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον. With Rom. iv. 21, δοὺς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πληροφορηθείς, cp. Rom. xiv. 5, ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοϊ πληροφορείσθω . . . κυρίῳ φρονεῖ . . . κυρίῳ ἐσθίει . . . εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ θεῷ, to yield our heart's fulness is tantamount to letting God regulate its workings. As regards the A.V. rendering of 2 Tim. iv. 5, N.E.D. says, "a thriving tree is said to be '*in good proof*,'" and quotes, "when you have fed your swine to his full proof" (i.e. perfect condition).

Πληροφορεῖν *in Apostolic Fathers.*

The following passages in the Apostolic Fathers are noteworthy :—

Polycarp ad Philip. i. 2 : ἡ βεβαία τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν ῥίζα . . . καρποφορεῖ εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

Ign. ad Smyrn. 1 : πεπληροφορημένους εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν.

Ign. ad Magnes. xi. : πεπληροφόρησθε ἐν τῇ γεννήσει καὶ τῷ πάθει καὶ τῇ ἀναστάσει κ.τ.λ., "put forth full fruit in."

Mart. Ign. 7 : παρακαλέσαντες τὸν κύριον πληροφορῆσαι τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τοῖς προγεγονόσι, κ.τ.λ., "Beseeching the Lord (Jesus) to put forth us weaklings in full fruitfulness to follow those that have been before us"—the germ of such a Collect as, "O Lord, Thou True Vine, who hast put forth in so great fruitfulness our fathers Thy martyrs, make us weaklings fruitful branches in Thee." Ἐπί="after," "to follow," as is shown by προ-γεγονόσι. Οἱ προγεγονότες is often found.

Clem. Rom. xlii. 3 : [οἱ ἀπόστολοι] πληροφορηθέντες διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . μετὰ πληροφορίας πνεύματος ἁγίου, *either* (Passive) "put forth as full-fruited branches" (or "borne as full fruit"), *or* (Middle) "having attained to full fruit-bearing" . . . "with a fulness of fruit-bearing of (i.e. wrought by) the Holy Spirit."

Ib. liv. 1 : τίς πεπληροφορημένος ἀγάπης, "Who has attained

to a full fruit-bearing of love." Cp. Herodian i. 6, 3, *εὐφόρους ὀπώρας*, "richly productive of vintage."

Ign. Magn. 8: *εἰς τὸ πληροφορηθῆναι τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντας.* The grace of Christ enabled the Prophets to change gainsayers into *fruit-bearers.* "That the disobedient might become *whole-hearted.*" (For *ἀπειθεῖν* see esp. Isaiah.)

Test. xii. Patr. Dan. 2: *τῇ πλεονεξίᾳ ἐπληροφορήθην τῆς ἀναιρέσεως αὐτοῦ*, "I was fully set upon" (lit. "fully fruitful of"). Cp. Clem. Hom. xix. 24.

Ign. Philad. *init.*: *ἀγαλλιωμένῃ ἐν τῷ πάθει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἀδιακρίτως καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει αὐτοῦ πεπληροφορημένῃ ἐν παντὶ ἐλέει.* "Exulting in the Passion of our Lord without making distinctions (i.e. rejoicing that He died *for all*), and in the power of His Resurrection endowed with full fruit-bearing in universal kindness" (i.e. kindness *to all*. Cp. Test. xii. Patr. Zab. 7, *ἀδιακρίτως πᾶσι σπλαγχνιζόμενοι ἐλεῖτε*, quoted by Bishop Lightfoot on Ign. Eph. 3).

Ign. Smyrn. 1: *πεπληροφορημένους εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν.* Cp. 2 Cor. i. 22, *ὁ δὲ βεβαιῶν ἡμᾶς σὺν ὑμῖν εἰς Χριστὸν . . . θεός.*

Here the participles in the other clauses are *passive*, *κατηρτισμένους—καθηλωμένους—ἡδρασμένους*, so we should render "borne as full fruit" or "caused to yield full fruit." The point of the citation (*ἵνα*) *πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ* seems to be that the coming of "the time of fruit," "the bringing in of everlasting righteousness," was the very object of the Incarnation—"that an universal righteousness might be brought to fulness by Him."

No one can study the attempts to explain *καρποῦ* (a few lines below) made by Bishop Lightfoot and the writers whom he quotes without suspecting that Ignatius wrote *either* *καρπός*, which is an echo of *πεπληροφορημένους* and also perhaps reminiscent of *καρπὸς δικαιοσύνης* (St. James iii. 18) suggested by *ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη* (cp. Phil. i. 11, *πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης τὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*); *or* that he wrote *καί*, the reading of one MS., and that *καρπος* was an explanatory gloss which crept into the text and was subsequently changed to *καρποῦ*. "borne as full fruit unto our Lord," or "having come to full fruit-bearing unto our Lord" (lit. "into," i.e. "by incorporation into"—see 2 Cor. i. 22).

Πληροφ. *in Papyri.*

In the Papyri *πληροφορεῖν* is found

(*a*) *absolutely*—of collectors "getting in monies (principal and

interest) in full" (lit. "yielding a full amount") (B.G.U. No. 747, col. i. l. 22); of a magistrate "doing his duty to the full" (lit. "making a full yield" of fairness). (Amherst Papyri, Part II., no. lxvi. l. 42).

(*b*) *with an accusative.*

(*α*) of the *person*, the man in whose business money is invested being like the *soil*, and the investor like the *yield*. ἐπληροφόρησα αὐτόν (B.G.U. No. 665, col. ii. l. 62). Cp. τυγχάνω δὲ πεπληροφορημένος τοῖς ὀφειλομένοις μοι (Oxyrhynchus Papyri 509).

(*β*) of the *money*,

ἕως ἂν τἄλλα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ὀφειλόμενα πληροφορηθῇ, "shall have produced their full yield" or "be fully yielded." (Cp. London Papyri III., p.163, l. 11).

There is an interesting use of the verb in the London Papyri I., p. 113, l. 910—

πληροφοροῦσα ἀγαπῶσα στέργουσα ἐμέ.

Whole-hearted devotion seems to be the thought. The construction may be explained by the financial use. If one with whom I invest money can be said πληροφορεῖν με by the return he makes, then the same language may be used of one with whom I lodge my affection.

Nature terms used financially, e.g. in Demosthenes: τὰ κεφάλαια καὶ τὰς ἐπικαρπίας (29, 60), ἐκ τῶν ἐπικαρπιῶν ἢ τἀρχαῖ', ἀναλίσκων (27, 50), τὰς . . . οὐσίας ἐκ τῶν ἐπικαρπιῶν διῳκήκασι (27, 64). Cp. τὴν ἐπέτειον ἐπικαρπίαν, Plato Legg. xii. 955 D. τὰ δ' ἡμέτερα χρήματ' ἔχοντες καὶ καρπούμενοι δεύτερον ἔτος τουτί (56, 34), ἵν' αὐτοὶ τὰ χρήματα καρποῖντο (30, 6, cp. 27, 44 f; 55, 1; 42, 21; 56, 4; 19, 249; 27, 5; 29, 43; 29, 34; 27, 47). Cp. Plutarch I., 504 E., ἔταξε τῶν τοῦ χρεωφειλέτου προσόδων τὴν τετάρτην μερίδα καρποῦσθαι τ ν δανειστήν.

Ἐπεχείρησαν.

This would seem to be the natural tense to use if the books had passed out of the writers' hands into those of the transcribers. The perfect would have suggested that the authors were still engaged upon them. So Polybius at the opening of Book iii. says of the subject of his whole work ὑπὲρ οὗ γράφειν ἐπικεχειρήκαμεν. The use of the aorist with πολλοί is like its use with πολλάκις. We say, "I *have* often crossed over to France; the Greeks, πολλάκις εἰς Γαλλίαν ἐπεραιώθην.

Αὐτόπτης.

It is perhaps well to consider the exact meaning of *αὐτόπτης*, for it has a bearing on the importance of those mighty *πράγματα* in St. Luke's eyes.

Polybius in i. 4, 7 contrasts *ἐμψύχου καὶ καλοῦ σώματος γεγονότος διερριμμένα τὰ μέρη θεᾶσθαι* and *αὐτόπται γίνεσθαι τῆς ἐνεργείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ ζώου καὶ καλλονῆς*, i.e. by *αὐτόπτης* he means one who sees the living creature *itself*, not its *disjecta membra*. So in Plato *αὐτοποιητικός* is rendered by Ast by "*res ipsas* (non *simulacra conficiens*," and *αὐτουργική* by "*ars ipsarum rerum* (non simulacrorum) *fabricandarum*," (Soph. 266 A. and D.). And in Æsch. Eumen. 366 *αὐτουργία* is taken to mean "murder of one's own kin." Cp. *αὐτοπώλης* = "selling one's own goods" (so both Ast and L. and S.). So "autopsy" = seeing the object itself. Cp. Polybius iii. 13.

Ὑπηρέται.

ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου—"those who had from the beginning been eyewitnesses (of the deeds) and became agents of the message (that told of them)." So *ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ καὶ οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ* (1 Cor. iv. 1). Cp. Wisd. vi. 4, *ὑπηρέται ὄντες τῆς αὐτοῦ [τοῦ θεοῦ] βασιλείας* (said of kings). Eph. ii. 17 represents the Crucified and Risen Lord as Himself the Evangelist. *Αὐτὸς γὰρ . . . ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην, κ.τ.λ.* His "agents" carry on His work. So St. Paul writes *τοῦ εὐαγγελίου . . . οὗ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος . . . πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ* (Col. i. 23–25).

Ἀκριβῶς.

For Isocrates' use of *ἀκριβῶς* see Phil. 59, Trapez. 24, Dem. 11. In Acts xviii. 25 f. *Ἀπολλὼς . . . ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς κ.τ.λ.* "A. taught *in full detail* the first appearing of Jesus"; then Priscilla and Aquila *ἀκριβέστερον αὐτῷ ἐξέθεντο*, "set forth to him *in fuller detail*," i.e. including what followed that appearing.

Καθεξῆς.

Καθεξῆς differs from *ἐφεξῆς* in that *ἐφεξῆς* requires the presence of a word, expressed or quite obvious to supply, to which it may be referred, e.g. *εἴ τις τὰς ἐπιβάσεις ἐφεξῆς διέλθοι* "one after another," *τὸ ἐφεξῆς ψήφισμα* = "the *next* resolution." In Plato it is often followed by a genitive or dative of that to which a thing comes next. *Καθεξῆς* = "by way of sequence," "bringing out continuity."

Κατηχεῖν.

In the treatise "de Fluviis" by some imitator of Plutarch κατηχηθεὶς περὶ τῶν συμβεβηκότων is used several times for "when informed of what had happened." And Philo (*Legat. ad Caium*, p. 1020) writes κατήχηται δὲ ὅτι καὶ πάντων ἱερῶν τῶν πανταχοῦ καλλιστόν ἐστιν. Kypke, who quotes these passages in his *Observationes Sacrae*, p. 298, adds, "In verbis Lucae κατηχεῖσθαι est *qualicunque imbui cognitione* etiam non accurata satis. Opponitur enim ἀσφαλείᾳ, cognitioni certiori et uberiori." (Cp. Acts xxi. 21). Bretschneider (s.v.) renders περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων "de rebus, quæ jam fama accepisti."

Ἀσφάλεια.

ἀσφάλεια in Plutarch generally means "caution" or "a safe and sober opinion" (see i. 817 B, 567 E.). In ii. 789 D. he writes λόγου . . . νοῦν ἔχοντος καὶ φροντίδα πεπνυμένην καὶ ἀσφάλειαν "advice full of sense and shrewdness and safe to follow" (Prof. Tucker's translation). In ii. 863 F. he advises the public speaker ἐσκεμμένῳ πειρῶ καὶ μὴ διακένῳ τῷ λόγῳ χρῆσθαι πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς μετ' ἀσφαλείας, εἰδὼς ὅτι καὶ Περικλῆς ἐκεῖνος εὔχετο πρὸ τοῦ δημηγορεῖν μηδὲ ῥῆμα μηδὲν ἀλλότριον τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπελθεῖν αὐτῷ. For St. Luke, as for Plutarch, a λόγος ἔχων ἀσφάλειαν was one οὐκ ἀλλότριος τῶν πραγμάτων. If Theophilus was a magistrate, there is a fitness in the word. Accusers and accused would seem to others besides Festus to be talking wildly and not "words of truth and soberness" (Acts xxvi. 24 f.), not words νοῦν ἔχοντας καὶ ἀσφάλειαν.

G. H. Whitaker.

OUR LORD'S OLD TESTAMENT REFERENCE IN ST. JOHN VII. 37, 38.

I SEE from Dr. Rendel Harris' article in the EXPOSITOR for September that, by a remarkable coincidence, he and I have independently been investigating the difficult quotation in St. John vii. 37, 38, and have both come to the conclusion that there underlies it a mistake in translation of an Aramaic original. My own study of the passage is bound up with a wider investigation of the Fourth Gospel as a whole, and I had intended to reserve its publication until this is complete. I cannot help fearing, however, that, once the theory of an error in translation from Aramaic has been propounded, some other scholar may examine the passage from that point of view and anticipate my conclusion; and so I have decided to publish it at once. It will be seen that my explanation, while differing from his in the main, agrees in putting a full stop after *ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ*, and in taking it as part of the invitation of *v.* 37. This conclusion was pure conjecture on my part, and I was unaware that it is corroborated by the testimony of the Western Text. From this point onward I give my note on the passage in the precise form in which I drew it up at the beginning of July, and communicated it to Dr. H. St. J. Thackeray, whose letter in reply is dated July 11.

Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς εἱστήκει ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔκραξε λέγων, Ἐάν τις διψᾷ, ἐρχέσθω πρός με καὶ πινέτω ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος.

The quotation which our Lord here refers to the Scripture has caused great perplexity. The fact has rightly been recognised that it is a free combination of several Old Testament passages which speak of a river of living waters

which, in the Messianic age, is to issue from the Temple-mount, and to become the source of life and healing far and wide. The principal development of this conception is found in Ezekiel xlvii. 1–12. We may notice especially *v.* 9, where it is stated that "it shall come to pass, that every living creature which swarmeth in every place whither *the rivers* come, shall live." Ezekiel's conception has been taken up by two later prophets. Joel iii. 18 (iv. 18 in the Heb.) predicts that "*a fountain shall come forth* of the house of the Lord, and shall water the valley of Shittim": while in Zechariah xiv. 8 we find the statement: "It shall come to pass in that day, that *living waters shall go out* from Jerusalem, half of them toward the eastern sea, and half of them toward the western sea" (the latter statement is based upon the passage quoted from Ezekiel, where the word rendered "the rivers" is vocalised as a dual, נַחֲלַיִם). We may believe that our Lord had all these passages in His mind; and in each of them I have italicised the expressions which I take to be most significant. In addition to these three passages, it can hardly be doubted that, in using the words, Ἐάν τις διψᾷ, ἐρχέσθω πρός με καὶ πινέτω, He was dwelling on Isaiah lv. 1 ff., "Ho, every one that thirsteth, *come ye to the waters*. . . . Incline your ear and *come unto Me*; hear, and your soul shall live"; and Jeremiah ii. 13, "They have forsaken *Me, the source of living waters*."

There still remains the outstanding difficulty, "*out of his belly* shall flow, etc." Even if, as seems more than doubtful, the thought is of the distribution of the blessing "in fuller measure" by its recipient (so Westcott, who compares iv. 14, vi. 57, v. 26), the fact remains that this conception as expressed cannot be connected with any Old Testament passage; and though we can understand that our Lord may well have combined the sense of the passages noticed

above, and that so doing His reference would have been immediately apprehended by His hearers, we cannot believe that He would have imported, or that they would have accepted, an idea which is not found in any Old Testament passage which speaks of the water of life.

I believe that the difficulty may be at once and finally solved by the hypothesis that the passage has been translated from Aramaic. As we have seen, Joel speaks of "a fountain." Heb. מְקוֹר; and the word is the same in Aramaic (employed, e.g., in the Targum of Ps. civ. 10, Prov. v. 16, viii. 28). The Aramaic for "belly" or "bowels" is מְעָן (Heb. מֵעִים); it is used, e.g., of the belly of the image in Dan. ii. 32. It will at once be seen that, in an unvocalized text, כְּעָן "belly" and מַעְיָן "fountain" would be absolutely identical. Adopting the word for "fountain," our Lord's words would run in Aramaic: מן דִּי צָחֵי ייתֵי לְוָת וְישְׁתֵּי מִן דִּי מְהֵימִין בִּי הֵיךְ דִּי אֲמַר כְּתָבָא (or הֵיךְ דִּי כְתִיב) נַחֲלִין מִן־מַעְיָן דִּי מַיִן נָבְעִין יְהוֹן נָגְדִין.

If "fountain" is correct, however, how can we connect "He that believeth in Me" with "rivers from the fountain"? I feel sure that the former clause really belongs to the offer preceding it. On this view the Aramaic yields the sense—

> "He that thirsteth, let him come unto Me;
> And let him drink that believeth in Me.
> As the Scripture hath said, Rivers shall flow forth from the fountain of living waters."

Our Lord, we are told, "stood forth and cried aloud," like one of the prophets of old; and His words, like theirs, fall naturally into grand and impressive parallelism.[1] The

[1] The opening couplet—

man dī sāḥē *yēthē lᵉwāthī*
wᵉyištē man *dī mᵉhēmīn bī*

seems to fall into lines of four-stress rhythm, and also *rhymes*—a characteristic which I have noted as marking the parable of Matt. xxv. 31—46,

quotation from Scripture which follows the parallel couplet summarises the main conceptions of Ezekiel, Joel, and Zechariah. When the passage was translated from Aramaic into Greek, מן מעין was taken to mean, "from the belly": and this was connected with "he that believeth in Me," and was therefore rendered, "from *his* belly."

C. F. Burney.

THE BOOK OF TESTIMONIES AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE FIRST GOSPEL.

For the purposes of this paper I shall regard Dr. Rendel Harris' theory as to the existence and antiquity of the "Book of Testimonies" as established. He argues that there was

(*a*) a primitive book of prophetical quotations

(*b*) divided into five sections,

(*c*) which five sections became the basis of Papias' commentary in five books;

(*d*) this book in five sections was attributed to the apostle Matthew, and

(*e*) survives in such a fivefold division in the work described as "Matthew the monk against the Jews."

Mr. Vacher Burch has shewn, in the pages of the Expositor, that the Sermon on the Mount is itself arranged in five sections, corresponding to five testimony topics, and it has often been noticed that the main body of the First Gospel (chaps. v.–xxvi. 1) is divided into five sections too (v. 1–vii. 29; viii. 1–xi. 1; xi. 2–xiii. 53; xiii. 54–xix. 1; xix. 2–xxvi. 1). The present writer is convinced that it came to be called the "Gospel according to Matthew," because it was obviously based upon the "Testimonies"

if translated into Hebrew, in which it may well have been spoken. See *Journal of Theological Studies*, Apr. 1913, pp. 414 ff.

compiled by Matthew in five books. Apart from the five sections described, the prologue (i. 1–iv. 25) contains seven testimonies, the epilogue (xxvi. 2–xxviii. 20) seven testimonies also; but our main concern for the moment lies with the intervening material.

Each of the five divisions ends with "And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished. . . ." When we ask what He finished we get a hint as to the predominating characteristic of the section just concluded. The first of the five sections (v. 1–vii. 29) ends as follows: "And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished these words, the crowds were amazed at His teaching; for He was teaching as one having *authority*." It is the custom of our evangelist, at the close of each section, to summarise its contents, and at the same time to suggest his next topic. In this case we have "He was teaching them" and "authority," along with a pointed contrast between *their* scribes and the new Teacher ("their" Matthew only). The subject of chaps. v.–vii. is, then, Jesus is the "prophet like unto Moses," giver of a new law with an authority as authentic as his, to which their scribes paid deference. "You have heard that it was said to the men of old . . . but I say unto you" is repeated five times in the course of the Sermon, the relation between the old law and the new being dealt with under five distinct testimony-headings (v. 21–27, 28–32, 33–37, 38–42, 43–48).

Chaps. viii. 1–xi. 1 comprise the second section, and they carry on the idea of the "authority" of Jesus, suggested in the first, into the realm of action. Following the principle indicated above, we examine xi. 1 and read, "And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished commanding His twelve disciples." One of the topics of the Testimony Book was "Christ is called Commander-in-chief"—He is not only the second Moses; He is also the second Joshua. His commanding authority is first illustrated by three cases

of healing (the leper, the centurion's servant, and Peter's wife's mother). All three have a place either in Mark's Gospel or in *Q*, but in all three there are touches peculiar to the First Gospel which lend sharpness to the recognition of this consummate personality. The disobedience of the leper is passed over in silence (compare Mark i. 45), as well as any reference to discomposure in the Healer. The Roman officer, so to say, salutes Him as One who commands the forces of disease with the same assured authority as his own over his subordinates. "*Only* give the word of command," he says; the word "only" is peculiar to Matthew. Instead of "she ministered unto *them*" the First Gospel—according to the best text—has "she ministered unto *Him*"; she had no eyes for any one but Jesus. This subsection is summarised in a brief reference to demon-possession—"He cast out the demons *with a word*," and a very felicitously-chosen testimony. The Commander makes Himself responsible for the ailments and diseases of His men; He can do so, because He is strong enough to bear them away.

The *three* cases of healing just mentioned are followed by *three* instances of power to command the services of men; each of the recruits is offered drastic terms, and in the third of the three we read "Follow Me" in place of Luke's "*Go* thou and preach the Kingdom of God." Again in viii. 23 the Marcan "they took Him as He was in the boat" is altered to "and when He had embarked in the boat, His disciples *followed Him*." Though some would not accept His terms, there were always others who obeyed Him unquestioningly.

Two stories, illustrating a yet more impressive exercise of authority, follow. In the stilling of the storm and the healing of the two demoniacs on the other side of the lake it is shewn that Jesus has authority over natural and

supernatural forces. Specially noticeable is ποταπός; for the Marcan τις; in viii. 27 ("What rank has this man?") and, in viii. 29, "Hast Thou come to torture *us before the time*?" The spirits recognise His authority, but protest against its premature exercise. Our evangelist has δαίμονες instead of the normal δαιμόνια in this place; not merely the demons, but spiritual forces in general, are subject to the Lord's command. Remarkable, too, is the studiously dignified form of words at the end of the story; "the whole town went out to a meeting with Jesus," in place of Mark's "they came to Jesus." Matthew attaches a special significance to the idea of *coming* to Jesus: a study of ix. 10 ("came"—Matt. only); xix. 14 ("leave the children alone and do not prevent them *coming to Me*"—for Mark x. 14—"let the children come to Me; do not prevent them"), along with xiv. 6, 12, 29 (all peculiar to Matthew) is enough to shew that "Come unto Me" (xi. 28) is not an "erratic block" as casual readers of this gospel have supposed. Matthew avoids the phrase "came to Jesus" in speaking of this hostile meeting, and at the same time suggests that whole towns were moved when He came their way (cf. "all Jerusalem with Him (ii. 3) and xxvii. 51 ff.).

The incidents which follow at this point (Matt. ix. 1–17) take us back from Mark v. to Mark ii. This may be a case of correction, for it is possible that the second evangelist has put our Lord's break with official religion too early: but Matthew is clearly thinking of the order of ideas, so we cannot be sure that he is merely setting a Marcan displacement right. In this passage further light is cast upon the "authority" of Jesus; as "Son of Man," He has authority upon earth to forgive sins—He has power over the inner life of men. According to his custom, the evangelist strikes this note with emphasis at the end of the story: "the crowds were afraid, and glorified God who had given

such authority to men." The call of Matthew suggests His authority over the future of men as well as their past, the discussions about fasting and the company that Jesus kept, His right to abrogate at will the most cherished traditions of ceremonial religion. His mere presence among men means the coming of a new age. He is the Bridegroom, the world's desire, and, like the prophets' Jehovah, demands "brotherly feeling, not ritual."

The raising of Jairus' daughter carries the matter a stage further; Jesus has authority over *death* as well as over such natural or supernatural forces as control the lives of men. Whatever the cause of the discrepancy between the first two Gospels as to the time of the little girl's death, the *motif* of Matthew's account is clear. Moreover he concludes the story, not with any detail about the patient's condition, nor yet with the Lord's injunction to secrecy (Mark-Luke), but with a statement as to the growing fame of *Jesus* (ix. 26). At every point the *instant* effect of His commanding word is brought out into relief (ix. 22; cf. viii. 13 and several other passages). He does not need to drive out (as in Mark) the noisy crowd; instead of "He put them out" we have "and when the crowd was cast out": His mere presence is enough to shame intruders away. The story of two more cures follows, and again emphasis is placed upon the easy mastery of the Healer. Notice "do you believe that I can do this?" (ix. 28) and "when the demon was cast out" (ix. 33; cf. ix. 25, "when the crowd was cast out"). After a poignant reference to the Lord's sympathy with the *leaderless* people the evangelist moves on to his climax. Great as is the power of Jesus over winds and waves, demons, sin and death, His supreme authority is that exercised upon the hearts of His disciples—"when Jesus had finished *commanding* His twelve disciples" (xi. 1).

So far the "authority" of Jesus has been dealt with

under two headings: He is lawgiver and captain, Moses and Joshua; His is the *word* of moral authority and of exercised power. We begin the next section with "the works of the Christ"; we end it with "Whence hath this man this *wisdom* and *these powers?*" (xiii. 54). In the course of the section, it will be observed, attention has passed from actual achievements to the nature of the power which such achievements express. We have learnt to look a little closely at the closing words of any section of this Gospel for a summary of its contents; so we must make a note of the other word which occurs in the reluctant tribute of the men of Nazareth—"Whence hath this man this wisdom?" they asked. This suggestion is made quite early in the third section of the gospel: "*Wisdom* is justified by her *works*" (xi. 19). The connexion of Wisdom with works is now clear, and we pass from what Jesus did to what He was. He is shewn to be greater than David, stronger than Beelzebul, greater than Solomon and the temple he built. Who then is He? Solomon's name gives us the clue. Solomon is the master of the wise, the maker of parables *par excellence*. We go to the Wisdom-books, and discover a series of reminiscences in the words of Jesus about Himself. "She (Wisdom) is initiated into the knowledge of God" we read; so Jesus, translating into the language of personal relations, "No one knoweth the Father but the Son." "Come unto her" (says Jesus the son of Sirach) ". . . put your neck under her yoke . . . Behold with your eyes how I laboured but a little, and found for myself much rest": "Come unto Me," says the greater Jesus, "you *labourers* . . . take *My yoke* upon you . . . and you shall *find rest* for yourselves." He makes a Wisdom-claim in Wisdom-terms: in other words, He finds Himself in Proverbs viii. as well as in Isaiah liii.; He is the pre-existent Sophia. The same claim is

taken for granted in Matthew's version (xxiii. 34) of another Wisdom-passage, this time from a lost book of Wisdom. That there also He is quoting the words of "Wisdom" is clear from Luke xi. 49—"therefore the Wisdom of God said."

Wisdom is the hen that calls in vain to her brood, and Jesus is Wisdom. But in the Wisdom-books the Wisdom of God is also the "word" of God. Chapter xii. deals, amongst other things, with the subject of *words*; even "idle," casual words have their significance. Before we pass to the parables of *the word* (chap. xiii.), we should notice that our author is not unmindful of what is to follow in later sections. Jesus is not merely the hero of Proverbs viii.; He is to be found also in the Servant-songs. Very skilfully is the one conception modified by the other in Matthew's masterpiece of quotation (xii. 18 ff.): unlike the personified "Wisdom" of Proverbs viii., "He does not strive or cry aloud, nor shall any one hear *His* voice in the streets." After the parables of the word (or, alternatively, the "kingdom"), we have the great testimony summarising them all (xiii. 35). Four more parables follow, corresponding to the four which precede the testimony; all can be paralleled from the Wisdom-books. Wisdom is better than rubies (xiii. 44), she is at once seeker and sought (xiii. 44, 45), she gathers in of every kind (xiii. 47 ff.), she fills the treasuries of her disciples. It is clear that we are not far away from the Logos-doctrine of the Fourth Gospel here; if Matthew's presentation of the claim of Jesus is anywhere near the truth, we may well ask the question, may not the idea that Jesus was the pre-existent word made flesh have been inspired *not by Philo*, but by the Master Himself, explaining His own self-consciousness by help of the Wisdom-literature, with which there is abundant evidence that He was familiar?

The next two sections carry us to the passion, treating as they do the transition from the seat of recognised and acclaimed authority to the Cross from different points of view. The leading idea of xiii. 54–xix. 1 is two-sided; it may be summed up in the phrases rejection by the old Church, and the beginning of the new. The note of rejection is struck at once in the Nazareth story; the section is introduced by "He departed thence" and ends with "He departed from Galilee." Notice "He taught in *their* synagogue"; this is the first time in Matthew that the fact of *a synagogue-ministry* of Jesus has been mentioned (cf. Mark i. 21 ff.). John's disappearance clears the way for His successor's supreme appeal to His people; in the rest of chapter xiv. we have what may be called a series of experiments in fellowship. In chapter xv. the rupture with official religion is shewn to be complete, then follows the story of the Syro-Phœnician woman, suggesting that, if the children will not be fed, there are others eager for membership in the household. The "leaven" of the Pharisees is to be done away with, plants not of the Father's planting to be rooted up. Peter, who has already been the first to walk on the water with Jesus, is chosen to be the first and most authoritative member of the new synagogue; then come prophecies of the passion, for the logic of rejection must run its course.

All this, it should be said, answers to another testimony-topic: *Christ is the founder of the new Israel.* In the Transfiguration-story Moses and Elijah appear only to fade away again, while Peter, James and John are left behind with "Jesus only." Elijah, the herald of the new age, it is explained, has already come; the line is clear. In xvii. 24 ff. the relations between the passing and the coming order are defined; needless offence is to be avoided; the freedom of the new Israel from the fetters of the old does

not need to be insisted upon, for time will make it plain. Meanwhile candidates for the new order must be content to be humble little people. All the while the thought of fellowship is developing fast. We have the parable of the ninety-nine and the one, "thou hast gained thy brother," "tell it to the Church," "if two of you shall agree," "two or three gathered together (a synagogue in themselves) in My name." The relations between its members are described; they are "fellow-slaves," and each of them must forgive His brother from his heart.

The same topic is further developed in xix. 2–xxvi. 1, the subject of which is "Christ is the stone which the builders rejected, which has become the head of the corner." Its main idea is that of *revolution*. Those who had no *locus standi* in the old Church—women, eunuchs, little children—are to receive special consideration in the new, while the rich will find it hard to enter, because of their entanglement with the old order. The first are to become last, either voluntarily or by compulsion, and the people whom nobody wants, like the men whom no one had hired (xx. 7) are to be paid first and to have at least an equal share with earlier comers in the blessings of the Kingdom. Not James and John, but others (Codex Bezae) are to have the right and left hand places in the Kingdom. Nothing else but the measure and the enduring quality of their love for the Bridegroom is to decide the destiny of men and nations. In this section the colours grow ever brighter, the shadows darker: the wedding-garment and the oil in the lamps alike symbolise the one thing needful, that the moral unfitness ("both bad and good," xxii. 10) and the mental drowsiness ("they all went drowsy and were sleeping" xxv. 5) should be compensated for by their joy in His appearing. The note of mastery becomes ever more dominant: "Cannot I do what I like with *My own*?"

"I should have received *My own* with interest." He is Householder. He is King and Judge of men. This vein in the section we are considering runs out magnificently in the parable of the great last surprise, when all the nations are marshalled before His throne, and these *surprising discoveries*, which make our relationship with Him and His with us an adventure on both sides ("he *found* the hid treasure," "ye shall *find* rest," "he who loses himself for My sake shall *find* himself," "if so be that He *find* it." "He found others standing," "as many as you *find* call to the wedding") are consummated in the last surprise of all ("Lord, when saw we Thee?").

Side by side with the opening up of new channels of grace the evangelist sets the last stages in the abandonment of those recognised centres of revelation, the temple, the holy city, the chosen people. In a storm of anger and pity, of scorching and consuming passion, the Lord appeals to scribes and Pharisees; but the thunderclouds of doom are gathering fast, and He knows it is in vain. As the tragedy hastens to its crisis, our evangelist's dramatic power becomes ever more marked. Jesus leaves the temple for the last time—"Behold your house is left to you. . . ." "And Jesus departed from the temple and went on His way. . . ." "I tell you truly, there shall not be left here one stone upon another, all shall be destroyed" (xxiii. 38 xxiv. 2—Mark, "as Jesus was walking out of the temple"). From one point of view they had cast Him out of the vineyard (xxi. 39); from another, He had rejected them, after overwhelming them with indignant reproaches; this is suggested by the fate of the unprepared slave (xxiv. 50, 51)—"He shall cut him asunder" (with reproaches—cf. the story of Ahikar), "and give him his place with *the hypocrites*" ("hypocrites," since chapter xxiii., has become almost a technical term for the Pharisaic scribes). The evolution

has become a matter of moral necessity; "the King was angry, and sending His armies, destroyed those murderers and burnt their city"; out of their own mouths they are condemned, for have they not already been betrayed into "He will miserably destroy them, and give the vineyard to other husbandmen"?

As we pass from the last of the five sections, which have prepared us for the issue, the signal is given for the final act of the tragedy; "when Jesus had finished all these words" . . . "the Son of Man is given over to be crucified" . . . "*then* gathered the *chief-priests and the elders* of the people" (xxvi. 1–3); it is only a question of time now. Jerusalem, like the temple, is doomed because He leaves it; to "find a man" to carry the Cross with Him, He must go *out of* the city (xxvii. 32, cf. Jer. v. 1—"run ye to and fro in the streets of Jerusalem, and see if you can find a man"). The fig-tree withers up, because it was not ready for Jesus, and the fig-tree is the city (compare Luke xiii. 5, 6, where the parable about a "fig-tree *in a vineyard* follows a reference to the "sinners" *in Jerusalem*, and the parable of the wicked husbandmen with Isa. v. 1 ff.). In the trial-scene every one is conscious of an oppression, a sense of doom none can put into words; Judas seeks to thrust it away from himself upon the chief-priests, and they cast it back upon him—"you see to it"; the use of the money itself carries a sinister suggestion "to bury strangers in." That they could do nothing else with "strangers" but cast them out and bury them as speedily as might be, that Jesus Himself found Himself a stranger amongst them, and they did not know what to do with Him, except prepare to build another tomb (xxiii. 29) for Him, as they had done for other inconvenient arrivals, was their condemnation, and they half knew it. The phrase "innocent blood" (cf. xxiii. 35) haunts the trial-

scene; Judas, the chief-priests, Pilate's wife, Pilate, the "people," are all conscious that this is no ordinary prisoner on trial for his life; only the people are unafraid, though even under their reckless cry, "His blood be upon us and upon our children," we can detect the bravado of a half-realised fear. It is a tribute to the consummate art of the evangelist, or perhaps we should say to the drama inherent in the great story itself, that just here, where the darkness of self-invoked doom is heaviest, there is, and is meant to be, a suggestion of hope breaking through. "All the people" (xxvii. 25) said, "His blood be upon us"; could a Christian reader in the later years of the first century think of a prayer more ideally suited for his own last and bitterest need than this strange sentence flung out half-desperately by a people struggling in the meshes of a destiny too great for them? Indeed, have we not all to come to this, when our utter sinfulness, the horror of our share in the passion of the Lord, is brought home to us? His very name meant, as Matthew has taken care to tell us, "He shall save *His people* from their sins"—the same "people" who took upon themselves, little knowing what they did, the guilt of His innocent blood. It is no accident that the Cross follows immediately after this soul-shaking cry, for it means that Jesus Himself now passes under the shadow of the doom our dealings with Him had brought upon us; that, doomed or not, He cannot sever Himself from His people; what works of mercy and wrathful threatening alike have failed to do, love that moves on to despair and forsakenness, and still remains love, because it is the love of God, the love that is divine, because it will not let us go, shall achieve at last. In the last cry of despair, Jesus goes out into the dark with His murderers; the doom comes on unbelieving nation and callous man, but it is shared, and shared by God.

So at last we pass out into the sunshine, having watched the defeat and victory of love. The last words of the Gospel sum up all five sections. To make this clear, we will enumerate them once more: Jesus is Lawgiver, Captain, the pre-existent Wisdom and Word of God, the Founder of a new fellowship, while His coming precipitates a revolution which is to shed His blood and make Him Lord of the Universe. Only the darker side of the story of His advent has passed away. "*Teaching* them to observe" (chaps. v.–vii.) "all that I have *commanded* you" (chaps. viii.–xi. 1) . . . "lo! I" (chaps. xi. 2–xiii. 53) "with you" (xiii. 54–xix. 1) "all the days" (a swift glance back to ix. 15, "days shall come") "to the consummation of the age" (the grand finale, xix.–xxvi. 1). The writer of this paper ventures to claim with some confidence that, so far from being a thing of shreds and patches, the Gospel according to Matthew is a masterpiece of tragedy, an artistic unity, and that its governing idea has come from the Book of Testimonies, the importance of which in Early Christian thought and literature will eventually be recognised more and more fully.

J. A. Findlay.

A PRIMITIVE ONOMASTICON

We have recently been showing that the early Christians had a collection of prophetical testimonies against the Jews, which they employed in controversy and for the exposition of the leading tenets of the new religion; and this collection in some form or other antedated the whole of the New Testament writings as known to us, and may on that account be regarded as a part of the New Testament, seeing it was employed both by Peter and Paul and was perhaps the composition of no less a person than Matthew the Apostle. Its existence in various forms of tradition can be traced through the whole period of Christian history down to the time of the Reformation.

Now let us approach the investigation of a much slighter subject, the question, not of traditional collections of prophecies against the Jews and concerning the Christ, but of the traditional interpretation of Hebrew names. It is a problem which in some respects resembles the former; for here also we have a long line of collected interpretations, evolving in various forms, and coming down almost to our own day. The question is whether such a collection of interpretations is early; if early, how early? Is it possible that it also, like the *Book of Testimonies*, is earlier than the New Testament? It may be only a tract as compared with the other, but even a tract from the early days may give us some vital information as to beliefs, and may throw light on the literary composition of New Testament books, just as we have seen the *Testimony Book* to do. Let us make

the enquiry and see where it will take us. Everything about the early days is interesting; let us once more begin a search for lost origins and ancient forms.

If we were to turn to the Letters of Oliver Cromwell, we should find, in a letter that bears the date 1638, that Oliver expresses himself as follows:

"To honour God by declaring what He hath done for my soul, in this I am confident, and I will be so. Truly, then, this I find: that He giveth springs in a dry barren wilderness and where no water is. I live, you know where—in Meshec, which they say signifies *Prolonging;* in Kedar, which signifies *Blackness;* yet the Lord forsaketh me not."

Oliver is quoting the 120th Psalm, which some of us will know in the paraphrase:

> "Woe's me that I in Meshech am
> A sojourner so long:
> And that I in the tents do dwell
> To Kedar that belong":

but he quotes his Psalm with expansions and interpretations:

> Meshec = Prolonging.
> Kedar = Blackness.

Now where did he learn that? for Oliver had no Hebrew, even if he was an Old Testament saint?

The answer is that he must have taken it from the margins of his Bible, or from some table of the interpretation of Hebrew names at the end of his Bible: for instance, at the end of the Genevan Bible will be found such a table, and it tells us that Kedar signifies *Blackness;* but I believe that to find both of the Oliverian interpretations we may have to go to the Douay version. The origin of his references is what we are accustomed to call an *Onomasticon*, its longer name being *Interpretation of Hebrew names:* such onomastica are widely diffused: they are found in Greek, Latin,

Syriac and Armenian; and it is clear that they go back to very early times. Now amongst the forms in which such Onomastica occurs, there is one line of tradition which comes down from Alexandria and from a date not later than the beginning of the first century. If you were occupied in reading the works of Philo of Alexandria, you would find that he constantly gives illustrations of the meaning of the Hebrew names which he transcribes, such as that Abraham is the *father of an elect sound*, Israel is *the one that sees God*, that Rebecca means *patience* (it should have been *much patience*), and the like. And if, after reading Philo, you were to turn to the writings of the great Christian father Origen, you would find that Origen takes over the etymologies of Philo and informs us that Philo had written a separate book on the subject, over and above the allusions which he makes in his works to the meaning of individual names. According to Origen, Philo is the author of the first Biblical *Onomasticon*, and, whether this be the exact truth or not, the Philonean and Origenian etymologies are carried down as the main lines of a patristic tradition on the meaning of Hebrew names. The tradition itself must be early, but the question is whether it was originally in book form or only known by stray allusions; and if it existed in book form was Philo the first author, or did he use the work of some other collector? If we can settle these questions, we can then go on to ask whether the collection, supposing it to have existed, has left any trace of itself in the New Testament writings. That is the line on which our enquiry will be prosecuted.

In passing, we may remind ourselves that whoever made the first Onomasticon, whether Christian or Jew, the Old Testament itself invited such a collection. From its first pages there are attempts to give the meanings of the names of the people that occur, as that Adam means *earth* and Eve means *a living woman*, and Cain means *acquisi-*

tion (this last is certainly wrong: the word probably means *smith*, but we are not to assume that all the writers of Biblical legends were accurate philologists). So it was easy for some early student to follow the stray suggestions of the Biblical writers, and form a collection of all the names of which he could detect the meaning, that is, to form an *Onomasticon*.

When it is formed we are far beyond anything the Bible tells us of the meaning of its proper names: we are following the lead of Greeks, knowing a little Hebrew, or of Hebrews, knowing a little Greek. They will take us over some very rough country before they have done with us.

In the investigation before us, we are following the lead of a number of scholars: Lagarde, for instance, amongst his other multitudinous labours, found time to edit *Onomastica Sacra*, and in our own days the German *Texte und Untersuchungen* have given us, at the hands of Wutz, two great volumes of studies, covering practically the whole of the ground, a veritable forest of research where who wills may lose his way. Let us now return to Philo and his teaching and his explanations.

In order to keep our problem simple we will take a specimen instance, the case of the interpretation of the name Israel. We know the Biblical explanation; it means, "Prince of God," and is said to be given to Jacob because as a Prince he had prevailing power with God and man. That means that *Sar* is a *Prince*, and *El* is *God*. The explanation does not satisfy Alexandria. We find another derivation in currency: Israel is divided into three parts; *Ish* which means *man*, *ra'ah* which means *see*, and *El*, as before, which means *God*. Thus we have the equation:

Israel = man seeing God, or The man who sees God.

This explanation is fundamental with Philo, as we shall presently see; Philo does not know much Hebrew, or he

certainly never would have equated *Is* with *Ish*, the sounds being entirely different; but the explanation, to whomsoever it was due, was widely received. Jerome tells us that in his day it was rejected; perhaps that was because he knew more Hebrew than his great predecessor, or used better the Hebrew that he had. The etymology did not die so easily: bad philology is as hard to catch up and correct as the conventional slander. One man starts it, it will take more than one man's efforts to overtake it and suppress it.

But let us see what Philo really says on the point: here are a string of references.

Leg. Alleg. iii. 65:

"Whenever the mind raises itself from mortal things and is lifted on high, it is strengthened by the *Vision of God*, which is *Israel*."

De Plant. Noe. ii. 24:

"The Lord's portion is his people *Israel*: for consider again how he has called that disposition which is *capable of seeing* him (ὁρατικός) and is his genuine worshipper the 'portion and inheritance of God,' but the children of the *earth* whom he called *Adam* are scattered and dispersed."

Quod Deus immut. 30:

"Against those who wish to traverse the King's highway, who belong to the class that is *capable of seeing* (ὁρατικός) *which he calls Israel*, the *earthly Edom* engages in battle."

De Ebrietate, 20:

"Thy name shall not be called Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name. . . . Israel is the name of perfection, it intimates the *Vision of God*."

Quis rerum div. 15:

"The ancients used to call the prophets by the name of seers, but he who advances and goes out, is not only seer but God seer, he is named *Israel*, that is *seeing God*."

De congress. erud. 10:

"To the highest race falls the vision of the highest, that which really exists, for *Israel* is interpreted *seeing God*."

De profugis, 38 :

"*Israel* the true-born and the first-born has vision for his portion, for, being translated, it means *seeing God*."

De mut. nom. 12 :

"*Israel* is called the one *seeing God*."

De Somn. i. 27 :

"A fresh and better stamp is put on him ; he is called *Israel, the one who sees God*."

De Somn. ii. 26 :

"*Israel* is the mind that contemplates God and the world ; for it is interpreted *seeing God*."

De Abrahamo, 12 :

"In the Hebrew tongue the nation has the further name of *Israel*, which is interpreted *seeing God*."

Ad Gaium :

"The race has for its Chaldee name *Israel*, which in Greek is *seeing God*, the most priceless of all possessions, private or public."

We have given these references at some length, because they show that Philo's equation was

Israel = ὁρῶν θεόν,
and not ἄνθρωπος ὁρῶν θεόν.

Philo's *Onomasticon* has an earlier form behind it ; we can hardly suppose that if he was himself responsible for saying that *Israel* means *the man who sees God*, he would in his writings never have used the longer form, from the standpoint of etymology. So we infer that it is most probable that the *Onomasticon* which we are in search of is pre-Philonean ; and in any case, whether it be Philonean or pre-Philonean, so far as can be judged from this single case, it lies by chronological necessity behind the New Testament.

That the interpretation passed over into Christian cir-

cles can be proved in a variety of ways: we will give one very striking instance.

In an Oration of Melito against the Jews, which is preserved in Syriac, we find as follows:

"He honoured thee, he called thee Israel: but thou hast not *been found to be Israel for thou hast not seen God*, nor hast thou understood the Lord. For thou knewest not, O Israel, that this was the firstborn of God, who was begotten before the sun," etc.

The latter part of this is made up out of Testimonies from the Psalms and prophets, and the statement of Isaiah that "Israel did not know": but the first part involves the meaning of the name as equivalent to *seeing God*.

Now let us leave the study of this particular specimen of early philology, the further pursuit of which would be interesting but somewhat off the line of our enquiry, and let us turn to another instance, viz., the explanation of the name Jerusalem: we now pass from the Vision of God to the Vision of Peace: for according to the *Onomasticon* Jerusalem may be broken into two parts, of which *Jeru* means "they shall see," and *salem* means "peace."

Those who are familiar with the old Latin Hymns will recall:

Urbs beata Jerusalem
Dicta *pacis visio*,

which was translated from the Sarum Breviary by Dr. Neale into the form:

Blessed City, heavenly Salem,
Vision of eternal peace.

And there is Abelard's hymn:

Vere Jerusalem
Est illa civitas,
Cujus pax jugis est
Summa jucunditas;

and the hymn which some have ascribed to Thomas à Kempis:

Jerusalem luminosa,
Verae *pacis visio*,

which was Englished by Neale as :

Light's abode, celestial Salem.

All of these hymns versify the equivalence of the *Onomasticon* that

Jerusalem = visio pacis.

If, however, we are able to detect the etymological factor in the web of the Latin Hymns, we shall not be astonished to find that the derivation of the word was known to the composers of some of the later of the Hebrew Psalms. It is involved, for instance, in Psalm cxxviii. :

"*Thou shalt see* the good of *Jerusalem* and *peace* upon Israel,"

and in part, at least, in Psalm cxxii. with its refrain of "the peace of Jerusalem." Perhaps also it underlies Psalm xxxii. 20 :

"Thine eyes shall *see Jerusalem a quiet* habitation."

Here, then, the etymology appears to antedate the *Onomasticon*. We observe, however, that the *Onomastica*, at the earliest point where we can trace them, contain the explanation, not merely that "Salem" means "peace," but that "Jerusalem" means "vision of peace." A single instance will suffice from Philo, *De Somniis*, ii. 38, where he says that "the City of God is called by the Hebrews 'Jerusalem,' which is, when translated 'Vision of Peace' (ὄρασις εἰρήνης)," and explains that the real site of the Holy City is in the soul *freed from wars and of piercingly keen sight* which practises a *contemplative and peaceful life*.

From Philo the etymology will pass to Clement and Origen and Augustine, and to the *Onomastica* generally.

Starting then from these two instances of early etymological research, we may now ask the question whether any of the New Testament writers betray any knowledge of the

derivations which we have shown to be certainly current in their day. We will begin with the "Vision of Peace." That "Salem" meant "Peace" is in the Epistle to the Hebrews along with another derivation, for we are told that :

"this Melchizedek, King of Salem . . . is first of all, by interpretation, King of righteousness, and after that King of Salem, that is, King of Peace" (Heb. vii. 1, 2).

This is one of the places in the epistle where it has been claimed, with the utmost confidence, that Hebrews is dependent upon Philo ; for suppose we turn to

De legg. alleg. c. 25, we find that :

"God made Melchizedek, the *King of Peace*, that is, of *Salem*, for that is the interpretation of this name, his own high priest. . . . for he is called a '*just king*.'"

Now this contains the two etymologies in the Epistle.

We have to move cautiously in claiming dependence of one writer on the other, for we have already seen reason to believe that the Philonean etymologies are older than Philo ; in which case, why should not Hebrews have borrowed direct from the *Onomasticon* ? We may not be able to answer the question very decisively : but we can at least say that the influence of the Onomasticon is conceded whether it be direct or indirect.

When we turn from Salem to the longer form *Jerusalem*, we come to an astonishing discovery : namely, that Jesus Himself knew the derivation *Vision of Peace*. It will be remembered that in the Lament over Jerusalem there occur these words :

"If thou hadst known, even thou (sc. Jerusalem), in this thy day the things *that belong to thy peace*, but now they are hid *from thine eyes*" (Luke xix. 42).

Here the conjunction of *Jerusalem* with *peace* and a *lost vision* is sufficient to show that the Philonean interpretation (which may be much earlier than Philo, as we have

shown) was known to our Lord. It is the basis of His anti-Judaic argument, or rather, pro-Judaic appeal. Assuming that we have correctly divined the influence that was operating on our Lord's mind, we may with some confidence begin to search for the traces of the "Vision of God," which is a companion etymology to the "Vision of Peace."

In the Matthean beatitudes, we find frequent traces of dependence upon the Old Testament, the editors indicating them either on the margin or by a change of type. For instance, that 'the meek shall inherit the earth' is borrowed from the 37th Psalm, and must be indicated as having been taken thence (Ps. xxxvii. 11).

When we come to the Beatitude of the Pure in Heart, we shall find that the expression can be paralleled from the Psalms: one of the possible references is the opening verse of Psalm lxxiii.: "Truly God is good to *Israel*, to the clean of heart." This identifies the true Israel with the clean-hearted people, to whom in the Gospel *the vision of God* is promised.

The Beatitude, then, depends partly on the verse of a Psalm, and partly on an etymology. Jesus may, therefore, be held to have been acquainted with the linguistic equation:

Israel = vision of God, *or* man that sees God.

The observation which we made with regard to the interpretation of the names of Melchizedek and Salem as being taken from an *Onomasticon* leads us to some further interesting discoveries. Whether the Epistle to the Hebrews has been affected by Philonean exegesis or not, the author shares with Philo the allegorical method, and the main support of the allegorical method is the interpretation of names, which we have reason to believe had taken literary form before the time of Philo.

Let us now turn to another passage in Hebrews, one of the

noblest in a noble book, the comparison of the two mountains in the twelfth chapter. It is not necessary to repeat here what we have pointed out more than once elsewhere, that the text of Hebrews xii. 18 is hopelessly vitiated by the omission of ὄρει at the hands of modern editors, and that the suggested translation, which occurs on the margin of the Revised Version, which substitutes "a palpable and kindled fire" for "a mountain that could be touched and that burned with fire," is a hopeless piece of imbecility. Restoring the mountain to its seat in the text, we have before us the fundamental antithesis between SINAI and SION, such as occurs so frequently in Patristic writings. It is an assonance, from one point of view (in Greek at all events, if not in Hebrew), but it is more than an assonance: the two names stood next to one another in the primitive Onomasticon. It is, therefore, quite possible that they invited from the first an allegorical interpretation. One of the interpretations made of the name Sinai was to equate it with *ἄτος*, a bush; and this may be the correct Hebrew etymology; but when it passed into Greek and Latin hands by the repetition of a single letter, *Σινᾶ βάτος* became *Σινᾶ ἄβατος*, *inaccessus*, and *Sinai* is now interpreted as *the inaccessible*. If we could be sure that this explanation was early (we will return to this presently), the motive for the whole passage in Hebrews would be evident. It would begin by saying "you could not approach the burning mountain (Sinai)" and continue with "you have approached Mount Sion." Whether the *ἄβατος* explanation be early or not, the antithesis between Sinai and Sion is fundamental in early theology, and it invites the allegorical method of explanation. Nor are we surprised at finding suggestions of the use of an Onomasticon containing Sinai and Sion in Hebrews.

Let us try the same method of explanation elsewhere.

Every scholar knows how difficult it is to unravel the argument of St. Paul in Galatians iv. with reference to Sarah and Hagar, the freewoman and the bondwoman. He tells us that he is allegorising, and we should expect some explanation about the meaning of the names; but instead of this (unless he really means us to take Hagar as being equivalent to "rock") we have another pair of antithetic members for allegory, namely, Mt. Sinai in Arabia, and Jerusalem. This is varied by a third substitution of two Jerusalems, the bond and the free. When we look carefully at the confusion into which the Apostle has drifted (or perhaps his text) we see the key in the lock of the interpretation. He explains that it is Jerusalem, *which is our mother*. That takes us back at once to the text of Isaiah i. 26, μητρόπολις πιστὴ Σιών, "Sion the faithful *mother city*." That is where the tradition about "mother dear, Jerusalem" starts from: it was "dear mother Sion" first. Thus St. Paul's Jerusalem, on one side of the allegorical contrast is Mount Sion, and we have seen from his text that on the other side it is Mount Sinai. The antithesis is the same as in Hebrews: under the pair

Hagar the bound, Sarah the free,

we see

Sinai that begets bondmen.
Sion that is mother of the free.

If the antithesis in one case is borrowed from an Onomasticon, as we have shown to be possible for Hebrews, it will be equally possible for Galatians. The investigation has now become so interesting that we propose to take it further, for, as we stated, the word-play between Sinai and Sion and the allegories based upon them are common in patristic writings.

Among the pseudo-Cyprianic writings which are bound up with the works of that father, there is a group of anti-Judaic

writings which deserve a closer study than they have yet received, if for no other reason than this, that they are based upon the conventional tradition of *Testimonies against the Jews*, and are valuable aids to the knowledge of that tradition. One of the most interesting of these tracts is one written in very rugged and apparently African Latin and is entitled :

De montibus Sina et Sion.

The writer opens with a question whether they are the same mountain, for each of them is a mountain of law-giving : is it not written : "Out of Sion shall go forth the law"?

In order to resolve the question he turns to his *Onomasticon* and produces two equations from it :

Sina = aeterna temptatio et odium.
Sion = temptatio exacerbationis et speculatio :

the etymologies are in some confusion, but the Syriac reader will at once recognise that *temptation* is *nesiona*, and that *sena* means *he hated* : and it looks as if temptation had been put on double duty both for Sinai and Sion. What we are concerned with, in the first case, is his dependence upon an *Onomasticon*, and there can be no doubt of this, for he continues with a string of similar explanations for Adam, Abel, Enoch, Job, Abraham, so that there can be no hesitation as to his use of a regular collection of etymologies. And as the writer is full of early material, such as the *Peter Gospel* and the *Book of Testimonies*, there is *a priori* reason for believing that the *Onomasticon* which he follows is an early collection, such as might easily have been accessible to New Testament writers. The actual history of the translations which Ps.-Cyprian suggests is still somewhat obscure ; there is some confusion in the tradition, over which we cannot spend time at present. Our main concern was to show how the use of *Onomastica* became one of the funda-

mentals in theology, or as the Cyprianic writer says:

Interpretatio nominum designat veritatem.

And now let us go back to the 12th chapter of Hebrews, where we have conjectured that there had been a possible equation of *Sinai* with ἄβατος.

If we turn to the *Questions* of Philo on *Exodus*, which are preserved in Armenian, we shall find the following striking passage: it occurs in the section which is headed:

What does it mean that the glory of God descended on Mt. Sinai?

"The mountain is the natural place for receiving a theophany, as its very name implies, for *Sinai* translated into any other language means *inaccessum*. Verily, not to be ascended and *not to be approached* (cf. Heb. xii. 18, 'ye did not approach') is that divine place: the loftiness of the purest intellect may not be able to ascend thereto, but it suffices to *draw near* to it."

It was greatly to the credit of Wutz that in his *Onomastica* he detected the meaning of this perplexing "inaccessum" or ἄβατος of Philo, as a translation of *Sinai*. Jerome, who works on the lost etymology book of Philo, showed him the way by equating *Sinai* with *rubus*; and the LXX by translating it by βάτος. There can be no doubt that the explanation *inaccessum* is earlier than Philo and *a fortiori* earlier than Hebrews, and the explanation which Philo makes serves as an excellent commentary to the passage in that epistle, but without necessitating a dependence of one writer on the other.

We may now say that we have proved the antiquity of an *Onomasticon* in the hands of Jewish (Hellenist) and early Christian writers, and we have shown its influence on the text of the New Testament. One more lost book (if only a tract) for the time of the earliest Christian Church!

Rendel Harris.

WILLIAM SANDAY, THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE.[1]

That a theological influence of the first order has ceased to operate in person among us with the passing of William Sanday, none can doubt who know the history of Christian thought in the generation now ending. But the exact character and full extent of that influence are probably known only in restricted circles. Perhaps in Oxford alone, where he lived as professor since 1883, was it fully realised and understood. For the inmost source of the distinctive quality of his message was the man himself, with his rare blending of gifts and graces of character as well as of mind.

What really made Dr. Sanday's words, whether as spoken or read, so persuasive and inspiring of confidence was the feeling which accompanied them, that they came from a profoundly Christian mind. That is what gave them such unique weight with all schools of thought; and it was due to the personality behind them. This of necessity revealed itself most to those who saw his sincere and spiritually beautiful face, heard the ring of personal conviction in his utterance, and had experience of what he was in private, as his accessibility and simplicity in self communication to others made possible to all who sought the privilege. Yet he had a natural shyness, and an intense devotion to his work as a vocation, which hindered him from mixing in general society, though not from spending his precious time lavishly in the service of individuals; so that it was, in fact, only among an inner circle of friends and of disciples in methods of study that he was adequately known. Accordingly it is as one who enjoyed admission to that inner circle during nearly all his life in Oxford as professor, that

[1] It should be explained that the larger part of this paper was already in type before Dr. Sanday's death in the last number of the Expositor appeared.

I would here attempt some appreciation of what he was and of what he did for his generation and for the future, in the hope of helping others to prize and enter more fully into the legacy he has left us.

I.

First, then, as regards the man. It is hard to do any justice in brief to Dr. Sanday's many-sidedness and catholic humanity. Thorough as he was in everything, and therefore patient and searching even as to details in the many fields of study bearing upon his central interests, there was about him nothing of the dry-as-dust specialist: he always saw things in their true perspective and relative values, especially their human values, and so with ordered simplicity and proportion. He loved *justice* of statement in every sense of the word "just," and sought scrupulously to give the picture of truth its proper shading and the *nuances* answering to reality. Sweeping generalisations and all rhetorical indulgence he shrank from as deficiency in conscience towards truth—the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. On the other hand, his frank candour in statement and fairness towards views opposed to his own were recognised by all as among his most distinctive mental qualities, qualities running back into moral virtues and ideals, as does so much in the equipment of a truly great scholar. Further, a certain caution or circumspectness marked his writings, not only in phrasing, but also in the results reached—what he would have called "tentativeness," corresponding to the existing state of the evidence available. This characteristic was often misunderstood, as though indicative of temperamental timidity or want of proper enterprise and courage of mind. Such a judgment would be a total misreading of the case. Dr. Sanday was fundamentally eager, even impulsive, in temperament, with a fund of passionate feeling, especially

latent moral passion, below his gentle, courteous, and hesitant manner. But he had learned to distrust giving his impulses rein, and had schooled them to obey the guardian sway of reason, acting as judicially as possible, and waiting until all the evidence *pro* and *con* was reckoned with.

The truth is that he had a most exigent mental conscience, which both restrained him from speaking with assurance before he was sure, and felt he had the right to be so, and, on the other hand, would not suffer him timidly to hold back the whole truth of God, as he saw it, once he had completed the process of testing judged needful in each case. He was really most courageous and superior to personal considerations in uttering his results when they were ripe and the season was ripe, even though it might involve misunderstanding and blame in many quarters, those even where hitherto he had enjoyed habitual confidence. Before Truth, and the God of Truth, "he could no other." While ever anxious not needlessly to offend "those weak in faith," he felt it a sacred duty before God to others, and to the age as a whole, not to remain silent on such occasions, even where it meant withdrawing a judgment with which he had been identified, and that as an apologist of the more traditional position. This was the case particularly towards the close of his life, a stage at which men are most apt to feel fettered by their own record, even if they have not themselves ceased to be open-minded to fresh aspects of reality. But to any such tendency Sanday proved superior.

Before passing on, however, to deal further with this last phase of Sanday's development, as bearing particularly on his message, some words must be added to complete even the broadest sketch of the man behind the scholar. Nothing showed more strikingly the depth and vividness of his humanity than the way in which he would turn aside

from his eager preoccupation with his studies, as his congenial and appointed vocation, and knowingly sacrifice not a little of his precious time and energy upon some practical issue of the hour, religious or moral—in essence, if not in form—whether in Church or State, or in the mixed sphere where they overlap. This he felt befitted the Christian teacher in particular, whether as Churchman or as citizen. He did it, too, mostly where a cause, especially a minority cause, seemed to be treated unfairly or to be going by default for want of proper advocacy, or where he thought he saw a way to bring to mutual understanding sections either of the Christian commonwealth or of the body politic conscientiously opposed on some issue of moment. Here the scholar's fairness of mind, trained in more impersonal fields of controversy, gave him a detachment from the passions of public ecclesiastical, political, or social debate, and a judicial attitude to the interests on both sides, which tended to clear the atmosphere and show a fresh method of approach to a "give and take" solution. Very striking, too, in this connexion, was the way in which, during the War, he intervened time and again with a view to make fair-minded opinion in Germany and Britain see the situation as seen from the opposite side, setting forth and asking others to allow for the bias of German mentality, much in the way that Baron F. von Hügel, with yet more intimate knowledge, did in his masterly study on "The German Soul." All the time, too, Sanday was striving in private to prevent Christian ties between himself and certain German theologians from being broken by the strain of divergent views as to the rights and wrongs of the public issues involved.

II.

But it is time to speak of his qualities as a scholar in relation to the contribution he made to sacred learning.

The range of his studies was very wide. His familiarity with English literature, especially the great writers on the horizon of his earlier manhood—notably Matthew Arnold and Browning—and the happy way in which he used them to illustrate his meaning, must strike a reader of his books. To liberal culture of this sort he doubtless owed some of that breadth and sanity of judgment which marked all he wrote. But yet more characteristic was knowledge in many special fields, some of them but slightly connected with his central studies. To this his large and many-sided library bore striking witness, as would also a full bibliography[1] of his writings, especially his contributions to *The Classical Review*. Yet, while Dr. Sanday was a scholar of the grand style, and had his knowledge fully in control, it is with his equipment as a theological, and primarily a biblical and patristic scholar, that we are chiefly concerned. In this large and varied field he was a master everywhere, save for his lack of first-hand knowledge of Semitic languages—a defect which he took care to make up in large degree by use of the best authorities, both books and scholars personally consulted. It was, however, in the habits of mind and methods of precision brought to bear in his studies that he most of all excelled. What he credited Lightfoot with[2] he himself possessed in like degree, viz., a "very remarkable balance and combination of a number of distinct excellences—exactness of scholarship, width of erudition, scientific method, sobriety of judgment, lucidity of style." Both, that is, were superlative examples of the English school of sacred learning, applied to New Testament and early Christian literature and history. And just as

[1] It is much to be hoped that a bibliography of Dr. Sanday, such as that of Dr. Swete by Dr. C. H. Turner, may be compiled. Of his theological writings a fairly full one, down to 1895, is appended to a paper on Dr. Sanday in *The Expository Times*, vol. vii.

[2] Expositor III., iv., p. 14.

Lightfoot did much for Cambridge, as for English theology at large, by instilling his own ideals and methods into others, so Sanday did for Oxford. Especially did his example and personal influence create an atmosphere—of historic method and spirit—for younger men to work in, an atmosphere common to men of the most diverse ecclesiastical and theological traditions and tendencies, and one wherein all could work side by side, and with mutual respect, in co-operation with their leader in such study and with each other. The centre of his influence, where it was intensest because most personal and intimate, was his *Seminar* for joint study (by younger graduates in the first instance), under the lead of the great scholar himself, at work in his own workshop and, as it were, in his shirt-sleeves.

This influence, first as Dean Ireland Professor and then as Lady Margaret Professor and Canon of Christ Church, extended over some thirty-six years, spent continuously in Oxford. During that time the subjects of his *Seminars* corresponded with his own preoccupations. The larger one dealt successively with the contents of the earlier Pauline Epistles, analysed under their main aspects—doctrine, life, organisation, etc.; the literary problems of the Synoptic Gospels (the fruits of which appeared in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, 1911); and, finally, the historical contents of the same Gospels, compared and sifted in the light of their literary relations. The smaller one dealt with the Biblical text of Irenæus, and its results have long been in type, awaiting only Dr. Sanday's Introductory study in order to see the light of day.[1]

During most of the time covered by both *Seminars*

[1] This important contribution to the history of the "Western" text will probably be issued under the competent editorship of Dr. C. H. Turner, Dr. Sanday's right-hand co-worker on it. See also EXPOSITOR, Oct. pp. 344 ff.

(which met fortnightly in term) Dr. Sanday's attention was centred on the Gospels, with a view to a Life of Christ (of which the article "Jesus Christ" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* was the first draft), intended to be his *magnum opus*. But, alas, it was never written, although he spent immense labour upon studies preliminary to it, studies which had an important place in his own theological development, and which form weighty contributions to various aspects of critical and constructive theology springing out of the Gospel story and the interpretation of its Central Figure. These have been described by Dr. Peake in the last number of this magazine. It is enough to add that the non-fulfilment of the task he had undertaken was due partly to the excessive scale on which he planned the study of the antecedents and environment of Jesus' life and ministry; partly to the elaboration of the preliminary studies into finished courses of lectures; and partly to the external course of events—ecclesiastical, theological, and even in public affairs, including the War—in all of which Dr. Sanday's vivid humanity and sense of practical responsibility to his day and generation constrained him to make his own contribution.

III.

We come now to an episode which marks a distinct stage in Dr. Sanday's mental development, stimulating the theologian in him. It was a new friendship, one with a man of about his own age but of different mentality. Dr. Moberly, who was now his colleague in the Chapter of the Cathedral of Christ Church and in the Professoriate, was a man of great distinction, alike of character and mental gifts. Those gifts were complementary to Sanday's own as regards relative prominence and emphasis, being primarily philosophic, not historical. But there was that in Sanday which answered readily to the

stimulus of his friend's influence. It was in a review of Moberly's *Atonement and Personality*, contributed to the EXPOSITOR of May, 1901, that Sanday showed most clearly the impression made upon him by his colleague; while in the memorial appreciation printed in the *Journal of Theological Studies* of July, 1903 (pp. 485 f.), he sums up more fully the qualities of the man and his writings :—

"His mind was, in its characteristic habit, not inductive, but deductive. It was not his way to approach truth by amassing great stores of knowledge. He was not a great reader. It was by 'the born thinker's habit of ruminating' that Dr. Moberly got at his principles. Until the intuition came he was helpless; no piling up of material gave him the clue he wanted. . . . There is, therefore, a marked breadth about all Dr. Moberly's later and greater writings. In these works—*Ministerial Priesthood* and *Atonement and Personality*—there is a constant reference of detail to principle, and especially a constant dragging out to light of latent principles that might have escaped observation. There is also conveyed throughout the sense of thoroughness and mastery. The element of tentativeness is unusually small. One has always the feeling that the matter in hand has not only been thought of, but *thought out.* The construction is complete and without gaps. Right or wrong, it all coheres together."

One can hardly imagine a type of mental excellence more different from Dr. Sanday's own "characteristic habit" than this; yet each is only complementary to the other. The one is proper to the philosopher's quest of truth, the other to the historian's: and each of the two men was strong primarily in one of the two fields. But I must needs express my decided opinion that Sanday was stronger than Moberly in the two fields and methods *taken together;* he had more of the total qualification needful for reaching the full truth as to Christianity, facts and underlying principles alike, with all the discriminations and shading corresponding to objective reality. For, like Hort before him[1] (though

[1] Witness not only his Hulsean Lectures on *The Way, the Truth, and the Life*, and some others of his posthumously published works, but also, and specially, his *Life and Letters.*

perhaps not to an equal degree), Dr. Sanday, while a recognised master of objective, inductive method, was also far from lacking in philosophic instinct and interest, in the larger and essential sense which makes a man ever feel his way towards coherence of thought by the aid of a few ultimate principles, so as "to think things together." It is true that he claimed only to have what he playfully styled his "home-made philosophy"; but by that he probably meant simply that it was with him a gradual outgrowth of the sum total of his experience and reflection, rather than a more or less rounded system, constructed (perhaps early in life) on the lines and in the terms of technical philosophic categories of one type or another. It was not a philosophy of the schools in the strict sense; and, after all, neither was Moberly's philosophy fully of that order, as Sanday himself shows. In any case, Sanday's mind could not rest unless "things hung together" and were "all of a piece": and this he reached after, on a more and more all-inclusive scale, and with more and more direct reference to God and His action in the world of Man and Nature as the real principle of unity and coherence, as the years passed and he emerged from the mass of detailed studies which had hitherto preoccupied his attention with the nearer horizons. All along, too, he knew good philosophy from bad, when he saw it in others' writings; and that means a philosophic sense and capacity, especially when it can give reasons for its judgments, as Sanday could.

It was, then, a relative difference of approach and emphasis, and no more, that distinguished Sanday's mentality from Moberly's. This one may see from what he himself wrote[1] about the reaction which his friend's thought in *Atonement and Personality* set up in his own mind. "It is just this inner cohesion (of Moberly's 'reasoned

[1] *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, pp. 229 f.

system") that increases the difficulty of those who come to the book more or less from without, with a different set of ideas in their minds and with something which, however inferior, is yet of the nature of a system of their own." The more rigorous system of the one seemed to impose upon the other the alternative of antipathetic rejection or "a complete recasting—or, perhaps more correctly, a complete re-interpretation—of (his) whole creed." It is true that "system" is here used relative to the theological system or "creed" as focussed on the idea of Redemption; yet in Moberly's treatment this was stated in terms of a whole philosophy of human experience, which found the key to all ultimate reality in God and man, and their mutual relations, in the idea of Personality, and personality viewed in a special way. It was however Moberly's conception of personality—with the stress on its inclusive rather than exclusive or individual aspect—that Sanday found at first largely strange to his own habits of thought. It pointed in the direction of a philosophic justification of Mysticism, in the sense proper to the Pauline Mysticism, which Sanday had not hitherto "thought out," or, indeed, conceived as possible without falling into Pantheism.

The theory of Atonement to which his philosophy of Personality led Moberly, seemed to Sanday at the time not fully warranted, exegetically, as Scriptural and particularly as Pauline. Yet he felt attracted to it in some ways, for instance as "in the fullest possible accord with the tendencies of modern thought," as the more "transactional" conception of it was not. Later, however, he came, through study of Dr. Du Bose's *The Gospel According to St. Paul*, to see the two types of theory no longer as "alternative views," either of which the Church might allow (p. 237), but rather as not on the same plane, and so not mutually exclusive. The theory of Christ's self-identification in

"vicarious penitence" with sinful humanity, in virtue of His uniquely inclusive human personality, and its effect in imparting the New Righteousness of Christ by the Holy Spirit—the Spirit of Christ—he came to recognise as true "in regard *to the ultimate nature of things*"; while his own reservations, on the score of Paul's doctrine of justification by imputed Righteousness, "belonged not to that region, but in part to that of history, and still more to Biblical exegesis and practical religion" (pp. 288 f.).

Thus already by 1901 we see, in connexion with the influence of Dr. Moberly upon his thought, that Dr. Sanday was turning his mind more than heretofore to the philosophical aspect of Biblical exegesis and doctrine. In the years which follow, especially from 1905 onwards, we find this tendency growingly marked in his mental history. The fruits of this period as regards Biblical studies, and particularly the element of miracle in the Bible, have been described by Dr. Peake (as above, pp. 326 ff.). But something remains to be said as to its more theological aspects, in their bearing on the man and his total message.

IV.

The transition to Dr. Sanday's later theology, and a prime factor in it, appear in his review[1] of Du Bose's *Gospel according to St. Paul*. Accepting the author's idea of "the universal humanity of our Lord"—what Moberly called His "inclusive humanity"—he remarks that "such teaching . . . is bound to be rejected by all Individualists in philosophy," and adds, "in 1901 I had not a little hesitation on the subject myself." There follows a statement of the view in his own language. "The Holy Spirit is the bond which binds all humanity together in one. In each one of us He is present after our measure, but in Christ He dwelt as the

[1] *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, pp 308–10.

fullness of the Godhead bodily. It is that fullness of indwelling which gathers together the multitudinous units into Him and communicates His experiences to them."

It may well be that Sanday here really states the matter in a way rather his own than that of Du Bose or Moberly. But he certainly was stimulated by them to a fresh philosophical construction of the Incarnation, differing from the traditional lines of his earlier manner. In any case his new construction contained an addition all his own, as to the mode in which such an "inclusive humanity" could be conceived as developed in Christ, viz., by bringing to bear on Christology the modern psychology of the "subliminal" and "supraliminal" self. To this he had been led through realising, by the aid of Moberly and Du Bose, far more vividly than before the fullness of meaning which the language of mystical union conveys and is intended (in the N.T.) to convey.[1]

Whether his venture was successful or otherwise is not now the question. Personally I think he was right as far as he went, when his meaning is judged by his exposition of it as a whole, including that in *Personality in Christ and Ourselves* (1911). His psychological method of approach was, in its way, a genuine contribution to the lines on which progress in Christology is bound to come, if the formalism of the Creed of Chalcedon is to be transcended and a vision of the God-man as a unified consciousness and character is to be won—as is needful for Christianity as practical religion, as well as in order to make the Incarnation a theory credible to the modern mind. But what one is here most concerned to note is the simple fact that it was Dr. Sanday who ventured thus

[1] *Christologies, Ancient and Modern*, p. 154. Here we have one more instance, and an impressive one, of the fact that all religious thinking, and, indeed, all thorough thinking other than materialistic, finds itself in the end face to face with mysticism.

to break fresh ground in the realm of high theology, towards the end of a life devoted in the main to cautious, inductive interrogation of the historic Christian origins. And this, as I have argued, meant no abrupt break with his proper self, either in his native or acquired aptitudes, but only the definite emergence of a latent instinct for the ultimate aspects of religion and theology which had for long years been held in severe restraint by well-grounded suspicion that the conditions for sure advance towards solutions of such problems, on their historical side even more than on their philosophical, were not yet ripe.

It may be claimed, then, that Sanday was in fact a larger and deeper thinker, and to that extent a greater man, than has yet been generally realised, though the full man emerged into view relatively late. From such an estimate of him two things follow as regards his message. (1) Not only his methods of research, but also his results in their whole drift and tendency—and particularly those of his riper period, when he had largely completed his preparatory self-education [1]—are entitled to enhanced authority by reason of the kind of mind to which they came to commend themselves as approximately true. (2) The spectacle of such a man going on learning to the end of his long career, revising and often frankly modifying, even in some cases reversing (though always in real continuity with certain elements in his earlier results), the findings of his more immature vision of facts and principles, is one of the most inspiring and reassuring for faith—to those who have the eyes to see. For there was no slackening in Sanday's confidence that in religion, above all in the religion of Christ, man is dealing with the truth of things in its most real and

[1] *Divine Overruling*, p. 61. "The landmarks of my life have been landmarks in a process of self-education. . . . And I have not been sparing of self-criticism."

ultimate aspects. On the other hand he came increasingly to distinguish[1] living *ideas* from their successive garments of thought, those *conceptions*, or more or less metaphorical forms, of which the human understanding has to borrow the temporary use from sense-experience and imagination. But in wearing old and outgrown, the latter do but set in relief by contrast the permanent and progressive energy of the ideas which select, fashion, and then outgrow them as unequal to their own full nature. Like the poet of strenuous spiritual endeavour and the eternally youthful heart of hope, whom he loved to quote, Dr. Sanday lived in the spirit and faith of *Rabbi Ben Ezra :*

> Grow old along with me !
> The best is yet to be,
> The last of life, for which the first was made :
> Our times are in His hand
> Who saith, "A whole I planned,
> Youth shows but half ; trust God ; see all nor be afraid."

This progressiveness, this pressing on to fresh visions of Truth, whether in details or in ultimate principles, was a trait which helped to win him the confidence and loyalty of younger men in particular.

When, then, Dr. Sanday at length saw that in the region of his inductive historical research, in which his special work had hitherto lain, *the balance of evidence and so of probability* on several crucial points (such as the Fourth Gospel) had steadily changed, he felt the time had come to speak out what he saw. He was conscious of viewing things in a different perspective from that of his old "conservative or liberal-conservative"[2] standpoint, one which may, perhaps, best be indicated by calling it con-

[1] See the essays on "Symbolism" referred to below, and *Form and Content in the Christian Tradition*, especially its Preface.

[2] His own phrase in *Divine Overruling*, p. 61.

servative-liberal. The first clear symptom of this change was a lecture on "The Symbolism of the Bible," delivered in the winter 1906–7, followed closely by a special discussion of one aspect of the larger subject, viz., a University sermon on "Miracles," in February 1907. By "Symbolism" he meant the necessary expression of divine or ultimate truths under the relative forms of varying but progressively adequate conceptions; and in 1910 he issued in revised form his fuller views of "The Guiding Principle of Symbolism."[1] This he no longer confined to "the actual place which symbolism holds in the Bible," but applied generally to man's knowledge of things divine, the whole field of revelation; and in closing he faced its application to Creeds and Articles of religion and the individual Churchman's attitude thereto. He lays it down as the duty of modern Churchmen "to get at the *mind* of the Universal Church as lying behind the Creeds, and the *mind* of the National Church as lying behind the Articles."

Here Dr. Sanday definitely associates himself in principle with the "modernists" in the Church of England — though as an independent ally, a modernist "with a difference." His modernism came out more clearly from 1912 onwards, not only in his Church Congress address on Miracles of that year, but also in more elaborated forms, notably his friendly discussion with the Rev. N. P. Williams, entitled "Form and Content in the Christian Tradition" (1916), and his theological last will and testament published in 1919, under the title *Divine Overruling*. This contains, in the lecture "On the Nature of Miracle" (described by Dr. Peake, *ut supra*, pp. 327 f.), Dr. Sanday's *Apologia pro vita sua*, which should be read by all who care to do justice to him and his

[1] Appended to *Christologies, Ancient and Modern* (1910), which in its whole tone and method of treatment shows a new readiness to undertake constructive intrepretation in theology proper.

message. It forms the last of a triad of final utterances, summing up the findings of his professorial life. The first describes the new "Place of Comparative Religion in Theological Study," resulting as it does in a widening of horizon and an enrichment of the analogies in the light of which any one religion is studied; the second, on "Natural and Revealed Religion," deals with the effect of such study upon the distinction expressed by that time-honoured contrast. The common element binding the whole three into a unity was expressed by their author in his Preface [1] thus:

"The underlying thought is that not only the field of what we call special revelation, but the whole process of religious evolution must be included in our great divine scheme, which has its human side of progressive experiment, but has no less its divine side."

The master idea of the whole is suggested by the title "Divine Overruling," under which he published these lectures. To himself the difference between "the old and the new opinions" "is not a difference of essence. . . . It is only in accident(s) that they differ" (p. 59). This he goes on to draw out in a passage which deserves quotation in full, as giving something like the gist of his message at the last:

"This is what I mean when I speak of the difference of times. I look upon it that the Christian ages succeed each other; that each age has its own context or body of thought; that the transmitted doctrines which came down to it must be adapted and adjusted to this body of thought; and that by this process they do not lose their own identity. There is in them an element which may be described as *mutatis mutandis*. But the element which is strictly continuous and the same is very considerable indeed. Christianity is a great spiritual system. That spiritual system remains constant. Our object is twofold, partly an object of belief, and partly of life. We desire to think of God as Christ thought of Him, and as St. Paul and St. John thought of Him. And we desire also to remain in the same personal relation to God and Christ in which the apostles and the apostolic

[1] Compare the Preface to *Form and Content in the Christian Tradition*, p. xi.

writers stood to them. That should be—and I submit that it is—a sufficient bond of identity and union."

"To think of God as Christ thought of Him," in character and attitude to men; to sustain a certain "personal relation to God and Christ"; these are the essentials, the elements of permanence from the first and always. Here Sanday speaks as the liberal Evangelical which he ever was, though never a Low Churchman—indeed, one who laid increasing store in a sense by the corporate *mind* of the Church universal as the continuous and living interpreter of Biblical revelation. But the accent now falls more on the epithet "liberal," which in religion means subordinating the letter to the spirit, and historical forms to abiding and self-renewing truths.

Space does not allow of reference to his ecclesiastical views.[1] They were those of a broad Evangelical Anglicanism, while showing an increasing tendency to prize "the historic Episcopate" in the interests of continuity and organic unity in the Church catholic. In this, as in so much else, he was a pioneer in the cause of Reunion as widely understood to-day in English-speaking Christendom. What he thought of the proposals in the Lambeth Appeal on Reunion I do not know; for he passed from us ere one could learn his mind on it. But of his sympathy with its eirenic spirit, and its recognition of the Catholic "Communion of the Holy Spirit" among all the churches of Christ, however organised, there can be no doubt. *Sit anima mea cum illo.*

VERNON BARTLET.

[1] See e.g. his papers on the Christian Ministry, in the EXPOSITOR, Third series.

"THE WORK OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY IN A PERIOD OF THEOLOGICAL DECAY AND RECONSTRUCTION."[1]

In one of Dr. Dale's singularly noble and impressive addresses delivered just over forty years ago to the students of Airedale College, he took as his theme, "The Work of the Christian Ministry in a Period of Theological Decay and Reconstruction." In the early half of the last century, Dale reminded his hearers, our fathers were in possession of exact definitions of all the great truths of the Christian Faith. "Immense provinces of Christian doctrine were laid down in their theological schemes with all the definiteness and clearness of an Ordnance Survey. Everything was so completely settled that even children were taught catechisms in which the nature of the Atonement of Christ was explained in a few lines, and the doctrines of Original Sin, of Election, of Effectual Calling, of the Perseverance of the Saints, were defined and demonstrated as though the controversy on these mysterious subjects had been finally closed . . . The great masters of theology had discovered so much that there was nothing more for mankind to discover. They had systematised the teaching of Christ so admirably that it seemed easier to learn from them what He had taught than to learn it from Himself. They had been able, so it appeared, to give distinctness to His teaching where it was indistinct, to supply by inference and analogy large and vacant spaces of speculation on which He was silent, to bridge over by philosophy the chasms which made it difficult to pass from one great truth in the teaching of Christ to another." In this way the task of the minister in those days was made

[1] An Address to the Primitive Methodist Ministers' Association, Manchester.

comparatively simple. "Definitions of every doctrine were under his hand, accessible at any moment. The substance of his sermons was found for him. He was travelling in a country in which the roads were all made, and in which it was impossible for him to go wrong. Every perplexity had its recognised solution; every difficulty had been bridged over for him by skilful theological engineers, whose work looked too sound and good to be distrusted. He moved from point to point as mechanically as you travel from Bradford to London: there are rival lines, but when you have chosen your route the rest of your journey follows as a matter of course; every one knows what towns you will pass through on the road and at what terminus you will arrive when your journey is done."

So matters stood in the early years of the last century. Now, said Dale—and he was speaking, be it remembered, as long ago as 1880—those great systems of theological truth are sinking into decay; their authority is lost. To many even of those who are still within our Churches, all religious truth seems to have become vague and indefinite, if not uncertain. "The substance of the ancient faith remains, but people find it hard to give their faith a definite expression; and on many questions which seem to lie remote from the central truths of the Christian revelation there is the greatest indecision and uncertainty." Nor is that all. With the tradition of doctrine has gone the tradition of the religious life. A generation or two ago "all Evangelical Christians shrank from the habits and practices which the tradition of conduct condemned, just as they shrank from the opinions which the tradition of doctrine condemned. To play at cards or to dance, or to go to the theatre, or to get into an omnibus or a cab on Sunday, was as great a revolt against an unwritten but authoritative opinion as to reject the Calvinistic theory of original sin, or the doctrine of eternal

suffering." Now, for better or for worse, this tradition, too, has gone, and as a consequence, many Christian people are in grave perplexity. "They are not clear whether the practices which the tradition condemned are lawful, or, if lawful, whether they are expedient. The rules which should govern the details of Christian conduct seem uncertain. There is indecision, there is a want of concentrated and sustained force in Christian character, corresponding to the doubt, the indecision, the want of concentrated and sustained energy of conviction in Christian thought."

I.

Such, according to Dr. Dale's reading of it, was the situation which a young man beginning the work of the Christian ministry forty years ago was called upon to face. It may, perhaps, be doubted whether the contrast between the past and the present was quite so sharp—whether the faith of our fathers was quite so cheaply won and held—as Dale's words would seem to suggest; but on that I will not now dwell. How is it with us to-day? The disintegrating forces to which Dale referred show no sign of slackening; on the contrary, they have multiplied both in number and in strength. We often speak of the present as "an age of transition"; but there is nothing new in that. Indeed, it has been suggested that the authentic words spoken by Adam to Eve, as they stepped through the gate of the Garden of Eden were: "We live in times of transition." And we have been living in them ever since. An age in which serious thinking men and women are at work must always be an age of transition. But the re-shaping forces have never, perhaps, been busier than they are to-day. I need not attempt any enumeration of them; we are all conscious of them; they play upon us unceasingly; they influence us even when we are least conscious of them; and it is in the

midst of them and amongst people whose minds, like our own, are fashioned by them, that our work as ministers has to be done. What should be our attitude towards them? This is a very large question, much too large for me to answer. I cannot bend the bow of Ulysses. But there are one or two things which some experience of the Christian ministry has brought home to me of which I should like very briefly to speak. And for the moment I limit myself to the changes which have come and are coming in our doctrinal traditions.

II.

We have all been thinking this year of the Pilgrim Fathers and of their great adventure of faith three hundred years ago. Every one knows the famous saying of John Robinson, in his farewell address, about God having more truth and light yet to break forth out of His holy Word. But there is a further passage in the same address, by no means so well known, which equally deserves to be recalled. "He took occasion also," Winslow tells us, "miserably to bewail the state and condition of the Reformed Churches, who were come to a period in religion; and would go no further than the Instruments of their Reformation. As, for example, the Lutherans: they could not be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw, for whatever part of God's will He had further imparted and revealed to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it. 'And so also,' saith he, 'you see the Calvinists. They stick where he left them, a misery much to be lamented. For though they were precious shining lights in their times, yet God had not revealed His whole will to them; and were they now living,' saith he, 'they would be as ready and willing to embrace further light, as that they had received.'"

How far those who claim to be the spiritual children of the Men of the *Mayflower* have need of this word to-day, it is

not for me to say; but a great many of the people called Methodists need it. We have what we call our "Standards," and we set great store by them. Against that I say nothing, but this I will say: the very last man in whose name you can canonise the formulas of the past is John Wesley. We quote him, and we make much of him, but too often we lack his courage—courage, if need be, to break with the most sacred traditions of the past, and to follow wherever "the high white star of truth" may lead us. "We ourselves must Pilgrims be." All truth, however unwelcome it may be, is God's truth and demands not our fears but our reverence. "Though our hearts turn to David," says Spurgeon, in a discussion of the authorship of one of the Psalms, "facts must be heard." And there is no other attitude that is worthy of the Christian minister. To sit down before fact as a little child, to be prepared to give up every preconceived opinion, to follow humbly wherever truth may lead us—this, says Huxley, is the first duty of the student of science. Is it not also ours? Yet who does not remember with shame the wild panics into which we have suffered ourselves to be driven when some new revelation has seemed to call for a revision of our ancient formulas? For a Christian reader there is, perhaps, no more humiliating page in modern biography than that which tells of Bishop Wilberforce's ignorant attack on Darwin, and the trouncing which he received and deserved at the hands of Professor Huxley. Or think of the storm and fury which were let loose on the heads of the pioneers in Old Testament Criticism. These things, it is true, belong to the past. The pity of it is that we are so slow to learn from the follies of our fathers. Bishop Gore, for example, cannot have forgotten how the mild heresies of *Lux Mundi* provoked the wrath of Liddon, who told him that he was on "the high road to Nestorianism"; yet the Bishop himself has lived to propose doctrinal tests of such a

kind as would have excluded from the Christian ministry even so convinced and devout a believer as my late colleague and friend, James Hope Moulton.

Courage we need, not to be afraid, and, further, the courage to speak when the time for speaking has come. But when has the time for speaking come? It is there for the pastor —and it is of him alone for the moment that I am thinking— that the chief difficulty often lies. We are all familiar with the pleas that are so often urged on behalf of the unlearned: why should we disturb their simple faith?

> "Leave thou thy sister when she prays,
> Her early heaven, her happy views."

And we all recognise the legitimacy and force of the appeal. For the pastor there is, perhaps, no sharper test than his power so to teach new truth that the net result shall be a sense of gain and not of loss. But there is another side to the question. We may push our policy of reserve too far; we may take counsel with our fears rather than with the truth; we may preach what we imagine to be safe rather than what we know to be true. In some of our churches to-day it is usual, I suppose in the interests of economy, to lower all the lights, except in the pulpit, as soon as the sermon is reached. Is this a parable, one wonders, of how some preachers have come to think of their relation to their people? Do they believe that there are some truths which it is good for them to know, but concerning which it is better that their congregations should be kept in the dark? Then I say unhesitatingly they are so far bad Protestants and worse Christians. "Of all the forms of presumption and unbelief," says Dr. Dale, "which under fair disguises have wrought immeasurable mischief in the Church and the world, this seems to me one of the most fatal—that there are facts about God and about God's revelation which it is dangerous to let men know, and that men are more likely to trust God and to live

a good life if they are left with their ignorance uninstructed and their mistakes uncorrected." We ministers are debtors to the unlearned; but we do not pay the debt by leaving them to their ignorance; we owe them what we ourselves have learned. They have to be taught, they have to be taught the things concerning religion and the Bible that are to-day everywhere believed by those who know. It is difficult work; sometimes even it may be perilous work; but it has to be done, and Christian teachers are the men who must do it. Moreover, if the ignorant and unlearned have their claim, have not the educated also theirs? "The Saviour of mankind," says Dr. Sanday, "extends His arms towards the cultivated modern man just as much as He does towards the simple believer." And for us as preachers that means that we must seek so to present His gospel that it shall commend itself to the modern man's mind, so that, as Dr. Sanday puts it, he may enter the Church of Christ "with head erect, and without any real equivocation at his heart."

III.

But something more is required of the Christian minister to-day besides courage. In the address from which I quoted at the outset Dr. Dale declared that there is no home in the Congregational Churches of this country "for those to whom the claims of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Prince and Saviour of mankind are doubtful, who have no Gospel to preach, and who ought not to preach till they have one." And I hope we shall not shrink from saying the same of our Methodist Churches. There is a very striking passage in the Second Epistle of St. John, which the Revised Version has restored to us in its true form: *Whosoever*, says the Apostle, *goeth onward* (not "transgresseth") *and abideth not in the teaching of Christ hath not God.* That is to say, it is a duty to advance and it is a duty to abide—to abide in the teaching of Christ.

And your "advanced" man who has advanced so far that he has got beyond Christ, the Apostle bluntly declares, *hath not God*, and with equal bluntness would have added, no place in the Christian ministry.

We have reached a point at which I hope you will allow me to use great plainness of speech. Some of you at least, I know, are with me, heart and soul, in the plea which I made just now for greater frankness and candour in our handling of the religious difficulties which the thought of our time has forced upon us. But the greater the freedom we claim and exercise in this matter, the greater our obligation to make it plain that we "abide in the teaching of Christ." We owe it to ourselves, we owe it to our Church, we owe it to our Lord, to let our loyalty to Him be known of all men. We are "modernists," frankly and unashamedly; that we are so is not a sin of the mind, it is its nature; we cannot help ourselves; if we are to think at all, we must think as modern men. Yes, but we are Christians too, and we are Christians first, and there must be no reservations here. Our people for the most part are not unreasonable; they have a quick instinct which tells them when we are loyal to the central things; and when they are satisfied there they will not grudge us our freedom along the circumference. But they have a right to know where we stand in regard to the things without which our preaching is vain and their faith also is vain. "Nobody," says Dr. Denney, "has any right to preach who has not mighty affirmations to make concerning God's Son, Jesus Christ—affirmations in which there is no ambiguity, and which no questioning can reach." The words are as trenchant and incisive as Dr. Denney knew so well how to be, but, for my part, I find nothing in them to quarrel with. Why should a man want to be a Christian preacher on any other terms? Bishop Hall used to say that the most useful of all books on theology would be one with the title *De*

Paucitate Credendorum—concerning the fewness of the things that need to be believed. And the Bishop was right: the necessary things are few; but those few things are necessary. After all, to be a Christian believer does mean something. Once, when Mark Rutherford was in St. Paul's Cathedral, he pictured to himself, he tells us, the cathedral full and himself in the pulpit. "I was excited while imagining the opportunity offered me of delivering some message to three or four thousand persons in such a building, but in a minute or two I discovered that my sermon would be nearly as follows:—'Dear friends, I know no more than you know; we had better go home.'" And, of course, if that is all a preacher has to say, he had better go home. There can be no such thing as Christian preaching of which "mighty affirmations concerning God's Son Jesus Christ" are not the very pith and marrow.

Let me turn back for a moment to the saying which I quoted just now about "advancing" and "abiding." The Church must do both these things: and that means that each of us in his own ministry must set himself to do them. Sometimes, unhappily, we have left it to one section amongst us to "advance," and to another to "abide." Could there be a more fatal schism? To have the Church divided into two camps, its scholars on one side, its saints on the other—could anything be worse than that? In Cromwell's Parliament a prayer was once offered "that they that have zeal may have wisdom, and that they that have wisdom may have zeal." And that must be the goal of our endeavour. Dr. Denney used to say—and no man in our day has taught us more effectively how to unite the fearlessness of the scholar with the passion of the evangelist—that the ideal would be reached when our scholars were our evangelists and our evangelists our scholars. That is, perhaps, a counsel of perfection; there must needs be specialisation of function in

the Church, as in the world. But at all costs we must make an end for ever of the desolating antagonisms and suspicions of the past. To have the scholar and the evangelist at cross-purposes is to sterilise the Church's best endeavour. Evangelism which is afraid of scholarship has only a maimed Gospel, which will only commend itself to maimed men. Scholarship without an evangel is as futile as the wheeling of swallows round the church steeple. Moreover, the two have been so often united that no one should despair of getting and keeping them together to-day. No one would charge Luther and Calvin, for example, with any disregard of the central truths of the Christian Gospel, yet there are things in their writings that would make our modern literalists gasp. England has never known a greater evangelist than John Wesley; but when men use his name to justify a purblind obscurantism, one can only regret that he himself is not here to tell them what he thinks of them. Or, for a modern illustration, turn to Forbes Robinson's *Letters to His Friends*. He had been reading at the same time Wellhausen's *History of Israel* and the life of D. L. Moody. "Wellhausen's book gives you in outline the position of modern advanced criticism of the Old Testament. I had never before studied the history, from the critical point of view, really seriously. The study has proved extraordinarily interesting, and I must say that in the main I agree thoroughly with Wellhausen's position." Now hear what he has to say about Moody's life: "It stirs me up to realise more the worth of the individual, the surpassing value of man's moral and spiritual nature. . . . It has much the same effect as Finney's used to have in days gone by—it creates a longing to work and live for God, to bring men nearer to Him, to come nearer to Him myself."

Moody and Wellhausen—it is a very suggestive collocation; and it is hardly too much to say that the influence of the

pulpit in the days which lie immediately ahead of us will depend in no small degree on our power to unite in a common service the forces represented by the American evangelist and the German scholar.

IV.

Thus far I have been speaking to the man in the pulpit; my last word is to the man in the pew. No man, we are agreed, has any right to preach who has not mighty affirmations to make concerning God's Son, Jesus Christ. But when he does make them his right to preach ought not to be questioned, whatever other affirmations he may or may not make. For the Christian preacher, as for the Christian believer, one thing is vital—what has been called the Christian attitude to Christ. It is this that the great historic creeds of the early Church were meant to safeguard. When to-day we recite them this is the central fact of what we are trying to say—that for us Jesus is very God and very Man, our Lord and our God. And when once a man has made it clear that this—the ancient Catholic faith—is his faith, he may be trusted—he should be trusted—to go his own way, even though at some points he diverge from the rest of us. "There is nothing so dangerous," Lightfoot once said, writing about Inspiration to his friend, Archbishop Benson, "as the desire to make everything right and tight. I do not know whether it is that my mind is not logical," he went on, "but I find that my faith suffers nothing by leaving a thousand questions open so long as I am convinced on two or three main lines." They are golden words, which ministers and congregations alike would do well to make their own. Once in the early ministry of Dr. Dale, when some of his teaching had caused grave anxiety to many of his people at Carr's Lane, his older colleague, John Angell James, went to

one after another of those whom he knew to be disquieted, and exerted all his influence and authority to calm their fears and remove their suspicions. "You leave the young man alone," he said, "he has the root of the matter in him. The young man must have his fling." And if I had a voice that could reach to the men and women in our Churches to-day, this is what I would say to them: "Choose no man for your minister who has not the root of the matter in him; but after that let him alone; and if he wants his 'fling,' let him have it." No man can do his work, in a world that is intellectually free, who is not himself free. But in the Christian Church there is no work for him to do unless he be loyal to the Lord that bought him. *Loyalty and liberty*—in this twin sign we shall conquer.

GEORGE JACKSON.

JOHN VII. 37, 38.

THE discovery of the "Testimony Book" has provided a key which unlooks many difficult puzzles, and it is a pleasure to watch Dr. Rendel Harris fitting it into wards which have hitherto presented baffling problems to the ingenuity of the commentators. I believe that by giving one more turn to this same key, the "perplexity" which Dr. Harris left "unsolved" in the EXPOSITOR of September last (page 212) may be removed.

The text runs thus in the Revised Version:

"If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet *given*, because Jesus was not yet glorified."

Now in the first place it is necessary to decide what phrase it is to which the words "as the Scripture hath said" refer. Is it to the invitation to the thirsty believer to drink? or is it to the statement that "out of his inmost being shall flow rivers of living water"? When this has been decided, we shall have to adapt the punctuation of the passage accordingly. In the next place we must decide whether the words ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ refer to the believer or to Christ Himself.

i. Following the usual ungrammatical punctuation of the text, which leaves "He that believeth on me" out of construction, it has been the habit of expositors to explain the Scripture reference as giving the sense of a group of prophetical sayings, such as Isaiah lviii. 11, "Thou shalt be like . . . a spring of water, whose waters fail not"; Zechariah xiv. 8, "Living waters shall go out from Jerusalem"; Joel ii. 28, iii. 18, Isaiah xii. 2, xliv. 3, iv. 1, Ezekiel xlvii. 1 ff., passages which were understood by the Jews to foretell or describe the spiritual river of life which symbolised the gracious blessings of the Messianic age. So Westcott *in loc.*, "The reference is not to any one isolated passage, but to the general tenour of such passages as Isaiah lviii. 11, Zechariah xiv. 8, taken in connexion with the original image Exodus xvii. 6, Numbers xx. 11." This, it will be perceived, assumes that the Scripture reference is to the individual believer who would have within himself a spring of spiritual water perennially flowing for the refreshment of his own soul and the souls of others. Strictly, however, Isaiah lviii. 11 is the only passage in the group just cited which would justify such an expectation. And one does not feel satisfied that this is the solution of the difficulty. But suppose we alter the received punctuation and put the sentence into proper grammatical construction, following the Old Latin Version and the colometry of Codex

Bezae. Connect *ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ* with the preceding *πινέτω*, and translate

If any man thirst, let him come unto Me,
And let him that believeth on Me drink, as the Scripture hath said.

This is undoubtedly a reading which has very early authority. Codex Bezae reads:

dicens si quis sitit veniant
et bibit qui credit in me
sicut dixit scriptura. flumina dentre
ejus fluent aquae vivae.

(Dr. Harris, I think, follows the punctuation, not of Bezae but of Palat. (*e*): Bezae puts the full stop after scriptura. So at least Dean Robinson prints it in *Texts and Studies*, i. 2, 98).

Thus read and translated, the invitation of Isaiah lv. 1 leaps at once to the mind: "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters." And this does seem an adequate and satisfying citation. If, then, we decide that the reference to what "the Scripture hath said" is a reference to this passage which invites the thirsty to drink of spiritual waters, we need not painfully and dispiritedly seek for any passage or group of passages in the Old Testament the tenour of which would convey the idea that the believer would himself experience within himself a springing effluence of spiritual life. This may be a perfectly true and elemental fact in the believer's experience, but it is not to be justified or supported by this passage. Such support can be found in Christ's promise in the words addressed to the woman of Samaria: "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall become in him a well of water springing up unto eternal life" (John iv. 14).

Moreover, *ἡ γραφή* in the singular usually, if not always, refers to some specific passage or prediction, not to the

general teaching of the Old Testament. See Westcott's note on John ii. 22; where, however, at the end substitute for Psalm xvi. 10, Zechariah vi. 13, and see further Expositor for January, 1909, pages 41 ff. Here, then, is a further reason for finding so satisfactory and definite a passage in Isaiah lv. 1.

ii. I turn to the consideration of whether the words

Rivers of living water shall flow out of his inmost being

refer to the believer or to Christ. It seems extraordinarily odd that any one should have felt any doubt but that the statement refers to Christ, when the very next words are at pains to identify the living water with the Spirit, and to explain that the Spirit could not in this sense be operative until Jesus was glorified. The Spirit of Jesus naturally awaited its liberation in order to be able to act in another form after His "glorification." "I will not leave you orphans: I come to you." It is He who gave the Spirit when He breathed on them (John xx. 22), and from Him all subsequent gifts of the Spirit flowed. Rivers of living water did indeed flow out of Christ's inmost being. That there is very early authority for this interpretation is clear from the fact that this is the simple and natural way in which the writer of the Epistle of the Gallican Churches understood it. He speaks of the martyr Sanctus, while undergoing the cruellest and ghastliest outrages, being "refreshed and empowered by the heavenly fountain of the water of life which proceeds out of the heart of Christ (ἐκ τῆς πηδύος τοῦ Χριστοῦ)." Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 1.

iii. Now I give that extra turn to the key provided by the "Testimony Book," for I think its aid comes in here most usefully. Is there any passage in the Old Testament which the Testimony seeker could impress into Messianic service, and say that Christ was called a "fount"? We turn to Jeremiah ii. 13, "They have forsaken Me, the

fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." That the speaker was Yahweh would cause no difficulty in the way of claiming this as a Dominical Oracle. Moreover we find that the *Speculum* (Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat. xii., page 700) actually quotes John vii. 38 after Jeremiah ii. 13 under a section-heading, "Quod Dominus fons vitæ nuncupetur." I owe these references to Dean Robinson in *Texts and Studies u.s.*

NOTE.—This Paper was written in September, and in type early in October. Dr. Burney's article in the November EXPOSITOR makes a further suggestion, more fascinating, I think, than Dr. Harris's. It is remarkable that both Dr. Burney and I should have independently hit upon Jeremiah ii. 13 as the key-text behind verse 38b. I welcome his punctuation, and rearrangement of the words, as permitting them all to have been said by Christ; otherwise I was inclined to attribute verse 38b to an editor.—T. H. B.

T. HERBERT BINDLEY.

SOME NOTES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF JESUS.

IF it may be allowed for reasons which have been adduced[1] that the great passage Matthew xi. 25-28 belongs to the primitive tradition and that the words—

> No one knoweth the Son, save the Father;
> Nor does any one know the Father, save the Son,
> And he to whom the Son willeth to reveal,[2]

issuing from the consciousness of Jesus Himself, say no-

[1] Reference may be made to an article on "The Mystery of Christ" in EXPOSITOR, December, 1918.

[2] In *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 396, the Editors say that "it is very improbable that it is an accurate representation of the mind of Jesus, or of the earliest Christian thought, for nowhere else in the earliest strata does Jesus appear as revealing God to those who are ignorant of him, nor was that the message of the disciples to the Jews." That seems to be scarcely an accurate way of putting the matter, nor is it convincing in view of all that seems to be involved in the Sonship of the Son.

thing less or more than the truth about His great and comprehensive personality, then, no doubt, it may also be allowed that there are not awanting certain hints or indications which point to the fact of growth within that consciousness. It would be strange indeed if such a vital consciousness were to lie outside the reach or reign of the master-law of growth. If all's life, as one may put it, all's law. There is nothing in the passage itself which can be said to be opposed to that. Here is sonship in such complete accord with its idea, sonship of such an active or ideal type, that it is fain to impart the knowledge in which itself consists, and which is life to men. The fact that it carries with it the capacity as well as the choice to communicate its gift, shows that it is in no sense exclusive or remote, belonging to some region by itself alone. If the " all things " delivered unto it and drawn within its ken are akin to the " these things " unfolded to the babes, then the conditions attaching to the things in the one case and in the other must also be akin. Things of God they cannot but demand a kindred or a complementary attitude in men. " For he that hath, to him shall be given , and he that hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath." Jesus is not more confident of His own attitude to the Father than He is of the attitude required of others. He brings them under the selfsame conditions as He is conscious of fulfilling in Himself.

Or, in other words, He ranges His own personality under that law or those laws of the Spirit which He prescribes to His hearers. Which means that the truth about Himself, and whatsoever that implies, has been spiritually discerned. It could not otherwise have been discerned. " The spiritual man," as St. Paul has it, " sees all things as they are ; what he himself is none can see who has not the spiritual eye." He that hath, to him has been given. To Jesus His sonship

was a mystery which it was given Him to know by virtue of the spiritual eye, the light that was in Him. It was no less a gift of the revealing Spirit than a prize of the receiving or believing spirit. "No one knows the Son but the Father." It was only in and through a life absorbed in the passion to fulfil "all righteousness," or all the holy will of God, that He came to realise the total meaning of his sonship for Himself, and for the world. What that meaning was it is the aim of every student to explore, and something, too, of the process by which it dawned upon, and grew within His consciousness, normally as there is reason to suppose from less to more, or from stage to stage, till all that was implicit in the inner bond of sonship became explicit in the Messianic calling, or the Christhood, that being the meaning, mission, magnitude of sonship realised. There are data which have it in them to show that in tracing Jesus' knowledge of Himself we are not dealing merely with some fixed or static frame of mind, but with one that grew—grew by being subject to the very laws which He declared to man.

Now it is a difficult theme—the growth of the creative consciousness of Jesus Christ, which one perchance had better leave alone. But to leave it alone as though it were too high or holy ground to occupy is surely less a mark of reverence than to deal with it so far as the facts, or the fragments of the facts, allow. Is there any reason why we should not try to "gather up the fragments that nothing be lost"? No doubt it may seem the most futile thing of all for any sort of critic, standing as he does on ground so infinitely far beneath, to attempt to enter such an empyrean mind, and explore the course of its development. But the same might be said, in sooth, of all the masters who have risen to heights of greatness, and who stand apart. And yet it is true, essentially, of greatness that it is luminous

as other things are not, and discovers its advance from less to more. And this for the reason that greatness lies so close to the sources of reality that it is fraught with the law and order of the whole. Hence it becomes one of the least futile and most fruitful tasks to thread its line of progress from the day of small things to the day of great, from its first appearance to its last expansion within the bounds of time. Sir Sidney Lee says of Shakespeare that "his achievement from the beginning to the end of his career offers clearer evidence than that of any other writer of genius of the steady and orderly growth of his poetic faculty," even if "some allowance must be made for ebb and flow in the current of his artistic progress."

Now if this be true of the masters, it is true supremely of the Master, who in words spoken, works accomplished, and in mission realised, faithful to the truth that "nothing is hid that shall not be made manifest" unveils the laws under which He lived and grew to the stature of the fulness of His life. It is a life that lays it upon us to believe that its secret issued into light, its mystery into meaning, in accordance with the thought which permeates the realm of spirit no less than that of nature, and which finds expression in the remarkable verse, "The earth beareth fruit of herself, first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." It would be difficult to conceive of a simpler and yet a finer statement of the unalterable law of growth, and the fact that it is found only in Mark would seem to tell in favour of authenticity. It has been said that "it is very doubtful whether this truth, in relation either to the individual or to the community, was grasped by the apostles (not excepting Paul), not to speak of the Apostolic Church in general. This consideration is the best guarantee for the genuineness of this logion recorded by Mark alone. Its absence from the other Gospels may be due to the fact that it teaches a truth

in advance of the ideas both of the evangelists and of those for whose benefit they wrote." [1]

It is quite possible that even if the evangelists, or the primitive Church may not have grasped the truth, nevertheless, unconsciously as it were, they may have let it influence their thought. Thus the apostle in Ephesians ii. 21, using a rare word, *συναρμολογουμένη*, no doubt borrows the image from architecture, and is thinking of the process by which one stone is fitted to another in a building, but in iv. 16, the only other place in which the word occurs, he applies the same term to the structure of the body: "from whom the whole body fitly framed together, and compacted by every joint of its supply . . . maketh the increase of the body unto the building thereof in love." A parallel passage occurs in Colossians ii. 19, "from whom the whole body furnished out, and compacted by the joints and bands, increaseth with the increase of God." It is said that the apostle is using the physiological terms of the Greek medical writers, and Lightfoot quotes from a number of these to show "how even ancient speculation was feeling after those physiological truths which the image involves." And he adds that "we cannot fail to be struck in the text not only with the correctness of the image, but also with the propriety of the terms; we are forcibly reminded that among the Apostle's most intimate companions at this time was one whom he calls "the beloved physician" (iv. 14).[2]

We may take it, therefore, that the apostle too was feeling after something of what has now become familiar to our thought and speech, organic unity, and that what is looming through his metaphor here is the idea of the unity of the whole in and through the variety of the parts. Whatever

[1] Bruce, *The Kingdom of God*, p. 125.

[2] Lightfoot, *Colossians and Philemon*, p. 201. Cf. A. Robinson, *Ephesians*, p. 186.

may be thought of the metaphor as applied to "the building" of the body, the truth that underlies it is the principle or law of growth by which the "body of Christ" advances to maturity. And that there are hints elsewhere of the same truth, and that the apostle is straining after a mode of speech in keeping with the newness of his thought is shewn by his use of the expressive word *σύμφυτοι* in Romans vi. 5. which means "united by growth," the idea, again, being that of organic union like the union of the branch and the stem. One suggests that it should be translated "to become one and the same plant with him." There is another hint of the same in the repeated use of the verb *αὐξάνω* as in 1 Corinthians iii. 6 sq.; 2 Corinthians ix. 10; x. 15; Colossians i. 6, 10; ii. 19; 2 Thessalonians i. 3: see also Ephesians i. 23, Colossians i. 24. Whether he derived any or all of these terms from the beloved physician of whose presence he tells us in Colossians iv. 14, it is significant that the latter in the preface to his Gospel adopts what he regards as a novel method of his own.

Thus he says that many have already made the attempt to compose a narrative of the things accomplished in their midst, even as they were handed down by those who were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word from the beginning. And what they have done he would fain do himself, make a fresh and perchance a more successful attempt to present such a narrative as would show the sequence of events. Although he is but another of the *πολλοί* writing at second hand like the rest of whom he speaks, yet he would seem to claim for his narrative that it is an advance upon theirs inasmuch as he (1) has gone back to the beginning (*ἄνωθεν*), (2) has investigated everything (*πᾶσιν*), (3) sifting out the whole with scrupulous care (*ἀκριβῶς*), (4) the result of which is no mere string of scenes and sayings but a consecutive story reproducing the actual progress of events (*καθεξῆς*).

It is a considerable claim justified, in a sense, so far as the first point is concerned by the fulness with which the early history of John and Jesus is told, and so far as the last is concerned by the author's closer adherence to the order of events in Mark compared with Matthew. But in the sense in which the claim is made it is not justified, for the reason that Luke, as it has been pointed out, depends almost entirely upon Mark "for the whole framework of our Lord's life," and for the contents of his teaching draws from the same source as Matthew, "Q or its equivalents," and as regards the new material of his Gospel, notably the great interpolation, "there is little or no attempt to criticise it, to trace its sources, or to estimate its value."[1]

The point, however, is not as to whether St. Luke fulfils his promise to the satisfaction of modern critics, but that he has lit upon the constructive idea of an orderly arrangement of his data, and proceeds to write his Gospel with that before him. No doubt it is only a glimpse, and suggests arrangement rather than supplies it, still it is a glimpse caught by one of the first evangelists of process in the things of history analogous to that obtaining in the things of nature. And it lies with us, to-day, to follow up the glimpse, and retrace, perchance with more of that observance of detail which suits the modern mind, the stages in the evolution of the mission of Christ "inwardly, His consciousness of Messiahship; outwardly, his relations with the disciples and the people."

It is worthy of note to begin with, and in keeping with the author's point of view, that of both John and Jesus the beginnings of whose history he is fain to recall he says that the child grew (*το δε παιδίον ηὔξανε*), adding with regard to John simply that he waxed strong in spirit, but with regard to Jesus the further thought of "being filled day by

[1] Cf. Thompson, *Miracles in the New Testament*, p. 79.

day with wisdom" (ii. 40). It is clear that in his belief the growth of both was real, physical and spiritual alike, the growth of Jesus being only more complete in virtue of that quality of wisdom which distinguished Him, an inborn flair, might we call it, or such an insight into the heart of things divine and human that the writer could not but conclude that "the favour (*χάρις*) of God was upon Him."

Forthwith he proceeds to record an incident belonging to the boyhood of Jesus which serves to illustrate His native *σοφία*, and the *χάρις* with which it is so intimately bound. For there is something intimate and ultimate betwixt *χάρις* and *σοφία* which may be traced in the so-called Wisdom writings of the Old Testament, and which is there in a characteristically deeper form in the New Testament, as e.g. in Ephesians i. 8 and elsewhere. No doubt the incident is only one of many which Luke, had it seemed good to him, might have included in his narrative, but may he not have decided to let it stand alone just because it was so typical, and emphasised the fact which so impressed him? At any rate it is difficult to find aught in the story as it stands that savours of the "pretty legend." It is quite likely that "pretty legend" gathered around His boyhood as around His birth and infancy, but the fact that the story stands so much alone, clothed in a simple beauty of its own, and without a trace of the phantasy which clings to legend and controls it, is ample compensation for its absence from the other Gospels. There is the air and wear of truth about it which supplies the lack of evidence from any known source, and which, after all, is the only evidence that finally avails whether there be other evidence or no; or else there is nothing to distinguish fact and phantasy, legend and history. "It does seem to us, after all has been said," says Keim, "that this fine tender picture, in which neither truth to nature nor the beauty which that implies, is violated in a

single line . . . cannot have been devised by human hands, which left to themselves were always betrayed into coarseness and exaggeration, as shown by the apocryphal Gospels, but only by true history, by this history of histories itself." [1]

Now the value of the picture consists in the light which it casts upon the early stages of Jesus' growth, a natural growth, as we may say, distinguished by the kindred points of *σοφία* and *χάρις*. By far the most significant detail in this regard is the reply of Jesus to the question of His mother on finding Him in the temple sitting in the midst of the doctors; it is the core of the whole event, and the cause, no doubt, of its being preserved at all.

"Son, why hast thou done this to us? behold, thy father and I are seeking thee in great anguish. And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought *me*? Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?"

The Sinaitic palimpsest has simply "Wist ye not that I must be with my Father?" He is surprised not at their seeking Him, but at their not knowing where to find Him seeing that the only possible place (*ὀεῖ*) for a child is in his Father's house. There is nothing, surely, in the answer as it stands that is inappropriate to a boy so signally endowed, and who has passed his days in the kind of home from which the parents went up every year "as was their wont" to the feast at Jerusalem. They belonged, it is evident, to that more prayerful section of the people who were looking out for the consolation of Israel, and it would be a supreme concern of theirs that their child from a babe should know the sacred writings (2 Tim. iii. 15). The Jews began to be instructed in the scriptures at a very early age, and at twelve a young Jew became "a son of the Law." So that both as being a son of the Law and unusually versed in the Scriptures, Jesus, one may imagine, would be power-

[1] Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, ii. 137.

fully attracted to the great historic feast, and most of all to the national shrine itself.

Two things point to His unwonted knowledge. The one is His questions and answers to the doctors which filled them with amazement at His understanding (*συνέσει*). As to *σύνεσις* Lightfoot shows that it is frequently found along with *σοφία* and is an application of *σοφία* in the sense that it apprehends the bearings of things. It is the critical, discriminating power of mind that rightly cuts or divides the word of truth (cf. 2 Tim. ii. 15). The other is His wonderful reply to His mother. One can scarcely think, in view of what follows in verse 51 and of the facts as a whole, that it is true to say with Plummer that "there is a gentle but decisive correction of His mother's words "Thy *father* and I" in the reply, "Where should a child be (*δεῖ*) but in his father's house? and My Father is God." Does that not suffer from the common mistake of reading too much into the words of the boy? Is it not more in line with all the circumstances to say that the reply, without any attempt at the correction of any one, is simply an expression of His own intimate sense, instinctive and instructed both, of the Fatherhood of God, "a characteristically Jewish doctrine found in equal abundance in the Old Testament and in Rabbinic literature,"[1] which Jesus with His in-born wisdom, His swift intuitive intelligence must have seized and sensed from the first in the sacred writings? There was that in them which answered to the breathings of His inner life: deep calling unto deep.

For if there is one thing which may be said to be original to Jesus, the creative thing in Him, so far as we can judge, it is not the doctrine, but the dynamic of the Fatherhood, what we might attempt to describe in other words, even if they only half express the whole truth, as a living, open,

[1] *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 401.

absolute belief in His presence, power, purpose and the like, as an intimacy or kinship so intense that it left on all He taught and wrought the master touch of the Divine, as a being in or into the bosom of the Father (John i. 18). It is more a thing of life than of language or of lore, but even so there is many an historic parallel that makes it natural to suppose that this, the creative thing in Jesus, would show some presage of itself in His early life. One may recall, for example, the child Giotto, of whom the tale is told that Cimabue found him among the sheepfolds on the Tuscan hillside drawing with boyish art the outline of a sheep upon a stone, and recognising his talent took him to His studio, and by and bye Giotto became greater than his master; and these twain were the leaders of that inspired succession which culminated in the Golden Age of Raphael, Leonardo, Michael Angelo. So that if Jesus in His early years lit upon the elemental thing or thought of which His later life was but the unfolding and the fruit, it is only in its own province like what has happened in the case of the supremely gifted of mankind. Since coming events cast their shadows before them we need not run to miracle to explain the first approaches of the revelation—not so much a doctrine as a destiny—which afterwards possessed His soul.

As there is no reason, then, why we should not regard the incident as belonging to the history of Jesus, it becomes a valuable fragment of evidence bearing on the fact which the evangelist comes back to at the close and repeats with added emphasis, that "Jesus advanced in wisdom"—the word προέκοπτεν suggests the strong and eager action of a man cutting his way through brushwood (cf. Gal. i. 14), "and in favour with God and man." It serves to show that the revelation of the Father to and in Him—the dynamic of the Fatherhood—was no mere sudden, unprepared afflatus, but the issue of a long and fruitful process in which His own

activity was present all the while. He had His own share to contribute, His own part to achieve in what was both His Father's workmanship, or poem (Eph. ii. 10) and His own. So it was an actual growth like any other, physical and spiritual alike, the powers of the one expanding with the powers of the other, gradually, and also in acceptance with God and man. In Proverbs iii. 3–4 it is laid down that a kind and faithful character will be acceptable both to God and man.

> "Let not kindness and faithfulness leave thee,
> Bind them on thy neck,
> So wilt thou find favour and good repute
> With God and man."

Now if we go on to consider the factors which entered into His development it is significant to find it expressly stated in the same historic incident that "He went down with them, and came to Nazareth; and he was subject unto them."—ὑποτασσόμενος—which means that He continued to be subject unto them. It is possible to read so much in the boy's answer to His mother, that it becomes almost impossible to account for such a prolonged and patient self-subjection. But whatever Jesus may have had in His mind when He said "Wist ye not," etc., we may take it that it was not opposed to His continuing to live under the parental roof. We must think of the two things sanely so as to grasp their essential harmony. The wisdom that so early sought the Father's house and found itself at home there, was no less prepared to retrace its footsteps to the earthly home at Nazareth. May it not be said that we catch a glimpse here—another of those foreshadowings of which this incident is full—of the unity that moves right through the life of Jesus between what is due to God on the one hand, and what to man on the other? The one allegiance does not rule the other out, but runs along with it side by side. The "I must"

at Jerusalem is followed by, and in concord with the I must at Nazareth. The great word δεῖ so frequent on His lips, so fundamental in His life, is applied not only to the things of God but to those of man. This twofold strain of necessity is one of the supreme features of His personality, and it is here in its beginnings in this prophetic narrative. May we not account for it again by the same unusual knowledge of the scriptures? May He not have learned obedience, the freedom that is born of necessity, not merely by the things which He suffered afterwards, but by the things which he searched out and saw in the scriptures from the first? It is impossible to overrate the value of the scriptures in the course of His earlier or of His later life. When we think of the wonderful skill with which He used them, and of His insight into them, and how swiftly they came leaping to His lips in the "very hour" (Luke xii. 12) of need, we cannot but conclude that all this tells of a mastery which must have begun in His youth at Nazareth. A mind so steeped in the scriptures must have been long familiar with them. Familiar with the kind of familiarity that only comes of early and continued growth. He grew up in them as by and bye they grew up into Him.

For this reason one cannot think that it is true in any sense to represent Jesus as a sort of "inspired peasant" whose intuitions were His only gift and guide. A remark of His opponents in the Temple recorded in the Fourth Gospel, "How knoweth this man letters (γράμματα), having never learned?" (John vii. 15)—a far off echo, perchance, of the wonder which His first appearance in the Temple had evoked—is clearly based upon the belief that He is an uneducated man, self-taught, self-instructed, one who has never received a scribe's instruction in the schools of the masters; and yet they are bound to admit that He has a learned knowledge of the scriptures, and claims to understand them better

than they do themselves. Learned and yet unlearned, uninstructed and yet instructed! "Learned Rabbis there were not in Nazareth either then or afterwards," says Edersheim, though he also says that "in all probability there was a Synagogue School there, and if so Jesus would conform to the general practice of attendance." But the point is not so much *how* knoweth this man letters as *that* He knoweth them, and has schooled Himself into the kind of knowledge that knoweth under the inspiration of higher teachers than the Rabbis. It is knowledge both learned and alive. The truth is that so far from not having studied He has studied them until He lives in them and they live in Him. Thus He faces and foils the tempter with the living and active word "it is written," "again, it is written." Thus He interprets the principles of His gospel in their relation to the precepts of the law. And so often as His enemies seek to ensnare Him, they assume that He knows the scriptures in the original to which they appeal, and He meets them on their own ground and with their own weapons, "Have ye not read?"

Here surely is no mere inspired peasant, but a master of knowledge, and a master, besides, of that quality of understanding (σύνεσις), wisdom, insight, which sees through facts to faith, the presence of which, stealing through His questions and answers in the Temple so amazed the masters there. The whole incident serves to show, or at least to suggest, that this knowledge and faith alike, already grown at the time of the visit to Jerusalem, continued to grow in the long subject, silent years in Nazareth. It is worth noting at this point that Jesus all through His teaching lays stress upon knowledge as well as on faith.

Much as the scriptures and His study of them must have entered into His development, there are other factors which may be regarded as contributing towards the same result. In the absence of any shred of evidence one is left to infer

them from indications in His public life which throw back their light upon the course and conduct of His private life at Nazareth. But in a life so luminous as His, in which it holds true that "nothing is hid that shall not be made manifest," this is not mere guess-work as the argument from silence often is. For when the veil is drawn aside it is to exhibit one who has learned profoundly the secret of the home. In order to fulfil His mission Jesus had perforce to leave the home, and yet no one can fail to perceive that absorbed as He is in the duties of His mission it is always as one observant of the rites of home. Wordsworth in one of his poems "To a Skylark" concludes with the great couplet :—

> "Type of the wise who soar, but never roam;
> True to the kindred points of Heaven and Home,"

and in his sonnet on Milton he extols him thus :—

> "Thy soul was like a star, and dwelt apart;
> So didst thou travel on life's common way,
> In cheerful godliness; and yet thy heart
> The lowliest duties on herself did lay."

If ever one adorned the doctrines of the poet it was Jesus by virtue of a rare commingling in His life and thought of the great and little, of principle and practice. Here, again, there is that which seems to transcend the bounds of common speech, but the following passage from Shelley's "A Defence of Poetry" verges to the point before us. "The great secret of morals is Love, or a going out of our nature, and an identification of ourselves with the beautiful which exists in thought, action, or person, not our own. A man to be greatly good must imagine intensely and comprehensively; he must put himself in the place of another and of many others; the pains and pleasures of his species must become his own. The great instrument of moral good is the imagination."

Now of this power of imagination or imaginative thought by which a man not only takes his stand beside another, but

takes his place. Jesus was possessed to such an extraordinary degree that it amounts, as one might say, to a new thing in the records of humanity. As though it were a new faculty evoked, or one but dimly apprehended brought to light! In any case it stands as far above the range of sympathy as genius above that of talent, or creative art above that of common sight and sense. One may gather from the evidence there is, that a rare capacity like this breathing itself out in language and in loves as rare " advanced " in the home as it was fed by the little nameless unremembered acts and aspirations that are born there. Home is ever a vital, and, indeed, immeasurable force in the advancement of soul as of body, and is it not because Jesus partook of this advancement to the full, drawing into the depths of His being its precious lore of

> "Those first affections,
> Those shadowy recollections,"

that it is possible to trace clear through all His thought and attitude what might be described as an inspired homeliness? It is original to Jesus, but it is all in keeping with His insight into life in general that He should see so deeply into the office of the home in particular, and should clothe His gospel with the light of its grand simplicities.

> "He knoweth much
> Who knows not many things; and he
> Knows most whose knowledge hath a touch
> Of God's divine simplicity."

It has been truly said that " no poet ever drew from simpler sources than Wordsworth, but none ever made so much out of so little." And in this respect one may find a certain kinship betwixt the mind of the poet and the mind of Jesus. As the genius of the poet lay in detecting Nature's influences " just at the point where they were stealing unobserved into the very essence of the human soul," so the originality of Jesus, or part of it, lay in discerning the influences of

home as they bore upon the growth of mind and heart. Thus a frequent thought or word, like "he that is faithful in very little is faithful also in much," seems to spring directly out of the long experience of the home, in which the very little said or done from day to day has ripened into, or revealed a principle reaching far and wide as life itself. And in Jesus Himself, at any rate, there stands out a master of the very little as also of the much, one who, having seized the law or rather the grace that is hidden in the heart of home, made it manifest in the uttermost affairs of God and man. Like one or other of the masters of the arts who combines attention to the least detail with consummate handling of the whole; in which combination lies the secret of the finishing touch in all great art.

Now of Jesus it may be truly said that He brought something akin to this into His whole manner of life and thought, a living imaginative sense of the function of the little in the making of the great. Blake says that "he who would do good to another must do it in minute particulars," and the truth of that saying is writ large on every page of the Gospels. The Gospels, indeed, are a novel exhibition of the minute particular, the seeing of it and the doing alike, springing from the depths of that imaginative thought in which Jesus "advanced," and by which He identified Himself with the lives of men.

Thus, to mention but a few of these particulars holding infinity in the palm of the hand, as it were, one may recall the touch with which Jesus finished off His work of healing on the man of Gerasa who would fain have followed him and been with him. "Go home to your own people and tell them all that the Lord hath done for you" (Mark v. 19; cf. viii. 26); and that other finishing touch in the story of the child who was brought to Him on His coming down from the mountain, and whom He raised up, as we are led to understand, by the virtue born of prayer, "And he gave him back to his

father" (Luke ix. 42; cf. vii. 15), and that other so briefly given in the words, *καὶ εἶπεν δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν* (Mark v. 43; Luke viii. 55). It will be noted that all these incidents concern the home, and are glimpses of His homeliness, or of the imagination which inspired it. Further, as regards the parables which abound in illustrations of the same, one cannot but observe how, for example, in that of the Good Samaritan, one minute particular succeeds another, each so lightly and yet so lovingly and strongly drawn, that the whole remains as the most vivid sketch in literature of a man as generous as brave, as strong as tender, as resolute as kind, as faithful in very little as in much—the true philanthropist of every age. But perhaps the most revealing case of all is that which appears in the following passage:

> "And he sendeth two of his disciples, and saith unto them, Go into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water; follow him; and wheresoever he shall enter in, say to the goodman of the house, The Master saith, Where is my guest chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? And he will himself show you a large upper room furnished and ready: and there make ready for us" (Mark xiv. 13–16).

The whole incident is a finished piece of forethought and arrangement, detail after detail coming in to express the settled purpose of His mind. As often before, so now once again, and even at such a time, when, if ever, he might have been pre-occupied, He bethinks Him of the small as of the great, not forgetting the disciples' part in the preparation of the common meal. It seems a far cry from the home in Nazareth to the Upper Room in Jerusalem, but the last is just the climax of the first, "a perfect work" or witness of the spirit which advanced in the home, matured in the ministry, and fulfilled itself at the close in an act which lifted up the home, and enshrined it once for all in the centre of the faith and practice of the Gospel. It is the supreme example of the inspired homeliness of Jesus.

"The Holy Supper is kept indeed,
In whatso we share with another's need.
Not what we give but what we share,
For the gift without the giver is bare."

Which is but the secret of the home revealed, what is hidden in the heaven that lies about us in our infancy come to light, not sympathy merely, but membership in the total sense of one as being in and for another, self-identification, or, as Shelley puts it in the quoted passage, "a man to be greatly good must put himself in the place of another, and of many others: the pains and pleasures of his species must become his own." It is what St. Matthew means, and even more than he means when he quotes the prophet saying, "Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses" (Matt. viii. 17).

There is yet another line of evidence running through the public life of Jesus which casts its light back upon the long unwritten years in Nazareth, and shows that in entering upon His mission Jesus came possessed of a mind that was instructed in all the wisdom of the home, and able to apply it freely in behoof of men.

"Thy Heart
The lowliest duties on herself did lay."

Thus one of the elemental parts or precepts of His teaching is that which bears upon "the little ones," *οἱ μικροί*. Nothing, indeed, is more conspicuous in the first three Gospels than Jesus' ardent advocacy of the "little ones." They include not only children but also simple and obscure believers, such, too, as are described as weak in faith and liable or likely to be led astray. Now Jesus, as before, does not merely place Himself beside them, but puts Himself in their place. It is the attitude which He has made His own, and in which He stands out wholly self-revealed. If ever He imagined "intensely and comprehensively" it was in connexion with one or other of these "little ones." Possibly it is due to long familiarity of a sort that we are apt to miss

the extraordinary newness of the act by which Jesus sitting down one day, of set intent, in the stillness of a certain home, summons His disciples whose voices He has overheard in hot dispute as He went before them in the way, and to impress His vital message on their whole being, sight and sense alike, takes one of the inmates of the house, a little child, and plants him in the middle of the group, or "by His side," as Luke has it, which means, perhaps, "in the place of honour," and then folds him in His arms "as if He had nothing else to attend to but that child," nothing else to do but lavish love and care upon him. Here is one imagination with the touch of God's divine simplicity appealing to imaginations all unduly stirred by dreams of coming power and greatness for themselves. Surely a novel means, and not-to-be-forgotten, of convincing men that if they will but forget themselves, their proud ambitions, and the like, and when they chance to meet a fellow-being in the way, be he never so obscure or poor or powerless to aid their interests, will welcome him, and be to him as those that serve, on the ground that he belongs to Christ, they will find that in doing this to the least they have done it to the greatest. To act in this way, says Jesus—piercing as usual to the whole in the part, the principle in the practice—is to act just as God Himself is wont to act towards all His children. "For whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name receiveth me; and whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me" (Mark ix. 37; Luke ix. 48; cf. Matt. x. 40, Luke x. 16, John xii. 44–45, xiii. 20, xiv. 24, xv. 23).

One may, perhaps, the better understand the newness of this thought or attitude, if one compares it for a moment with that which is found in a famous work of ancient art, the Hermes of Praxiteles. It is a statue of the god Hermes bearing a little child, Dionysos, in his arms. As a group "closely unified" it is prophetic in a sense of later fact

and faith. But as an able writer explains "Hermes is not looking at Dionysos, he is not thinking of him. Dionysos, placing one tiny hand on the shoulder of the elder god, tries to attract his attention, but in vain. Hermes is the main motive of the group, the child is little but a mere appendage." Further, as the same writer says, "the child is a little old man, and therefore leaves us with a dwarfed, stunted impression. Until after the time of Praxiteles the Greeks cared little to depict infancy, because it was immature, imperfect. They would *indicate* a child if necessary by its small size, but they did not trouble to *express* it. We can scarcely suppose they saw no charm in babyhood, but we do know that they considered that charm unfitting to the dignity of art, and they were right."[1] Not, surely, as we may object, if Rembrandt is right, and others among the moderns in art and literature are right, who have grasped, unwittingly perhaps, the new, the epoch-making attitude and thought of Christ; an attitude and thought alike enkindled by imagination such as rose above even that of Greece, and set the least, not to speak of the lost, in the midst of the throne of God. One thing is sure, that Jesus did trouble to express the child as much as to express Himself. It is one of the creative aspects of the gospel. He troubled to express the child even to the point of placing him in a new relation to Himself and to humanity, of making him the member of a group or society, a holy family within the abiding ken and care of God. "See," he says in words that are peculiar to the first Evangel and may have referred originally to children only, "see that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. xviii. 10). The words are charged with passion, they are quick with the sacred feelings that are sown in the heart of home.

[1] J. E. Harrison, *Introductory Studies in Greek Art*, p. 258.

To take but another of these allusions to the little ones fraught with even more intensity and passion than the last, there is the fiery passage upon stumblingblocks contained in Mark ix. 42; Luke xvii. 22; Matt. xviii. 6–7. The context in which it stands in Mark and Luke has little light to shed upon its meaning, but the context in Matthew has more. For there in chapter xvii. 24–27 it is told that Jesus has just agreed to pay the Temple tax not because He must, but because He may thus avoid giving unnecessary offence to others. Fast upon that ("in that hour") comes the rebuke to the disciples, whose personal feelings have been aroused, as the Evangelist seems to suggest, by the fact that Peter has been approached by the authorities as if he were the chief among them, and their representative. And the rebuke leads to the impassioned utterance about the danger of doing injury to the faith of the little ones, the simple and obscure believers who are still, it may be, in their spiritual childhood. The connexion of incident and utterance would therefore seem to be somewhat on this wise, that if it becomes men to be careful lest they do aught to affront the proprieties, it becomes them all the more to be careful lest they do aught to tempt or provoke the "babes in Christ" (1 Cor. iii. 1; Heb. v. 13) to fall into sin. "But whoso shall cause one of these little ones which believe on me to stumble, it is profitable for him (in Luke the word is λυσιτελεῖ, lit. 'it pays the taxes') that a great millstone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be sunk in the depths of the sea."

> "Woe unto the world because of occasions of stumbling!
> for it must needs be that the occasions come;
> but woe to that man through whom the occasion cometh."

Not long before, Jesus Himself had to face just such a man, and such a σκάνδαλον.[1] For Simon Peter, with an air of self-importance and even of superiority, had drawn Him

[1] See Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, p. 174.

aside, and undertaken to rebuke Him. For this reason, that the Master had just unrolled a strange and startling tale of terrible sufferings and death awaiting Him, and the disciple could not but reject it as an idle tale: "May God be gracious to thee, Lord; this shall never be to thee." That the thought in the disciple's mind and speech, the whole bent, indeed, of his mind and that of the band, was such as to constitute a real temptation is shewn in the sequel. For Jesus not only turned sharply round to face the speaker and the rest, but gathered up the situation in a vivid flash of moral power—"Get behind me, you Satan. You are a *σκανδαλον*—stumblingblock—unto me" (Matt. xvi. 23). While He was strong enough to sweep the evil thought and the evil thing before Him, He knew full well that the little ones attached to Him would stagger and would fall before the same. Hence knowing what a *σκάνδαλον* meant Himself, and how in the lips of a chosen friend it had so hurt and shaken Him, He sternly charged His hearers to beware of their influence, lest by saying or insinuating aught they should injure or corrupt the spiritual life of others. Surely of all the uncommon things He said about the little ones, this one rings and rings again with the passionate love and care which make His language what it is, and by which He blent His life and theirs. Not the least attention paid to the least but is remembered and repaid.

"And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones
A cup of cold water only,
In the name of a disciple,
Verily I say unto you,
he shall in no wise lose his reward" (Matt. x. 42; Mark ix. 41).

Now when we think that it is within "the enchanted close" of home humanity begins to learn the law or grace of lowly deeds like that of the cup of water only, it is natural to suppose that Jesus, growing like the rest of men and under like conditions, started in the home, and advanced along that path of genial, godlike homeliness which runs unbroken

to the limit of His life. It is part of the wisdom of which He became full.

There is one other aspect of His wisdom, shining in His public life like "a city set on a hill," which seems to fling its illumination backwards upon the period of His youth. It stands to reason that a wealth of wisdom, "many-coloured wisdom" (Eph. iii. 10), such as glitters through His ministry, must have gathered colour as it gathered content in the long preparatory years. Now one of the features of His personality which is conspicuous, and peculiarly His own when He steps upon the stage of history is His ingrained habit of going apart into desert places, and to the heights of mountains.

"How use doth breed a habit in a man."

Thus He is no sooner baptized and called to His life-task than He is led up into the desert (*εἰς τὴν ἔρημον*) that there in the solitude and space he might grapple with the mighty vision which had burst the heavens open (*σχιζομένους τους οὐρανοὺς*, Mark i. 10), and revealed Him to Himself. And no sooner has He actually begun to preach and heal and cast out demons, than we are told that "in the morning, a great while before day, he rose up and departed to a desert place (*εἰς ἔρημον τόπον*)." And, again, so rapid is His early fame, and the popular excitement so intense that He has to escape from it all for a time, "he could no longer openly enter a city, but was without in desert places" (Mark i. 45). And on a later occasion, under the stress of like necessity, He says to His disciples, "Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest a little while (*ὀλίγον*)" (Mark vi. 31). In every case, it will be observed, it was a spiritual purpose which impelled Him to withdraw at the bidding of a spirit which craved the solitudes of nature almost as it craved the souls of men. Mark and Luke both record that He "there prayed" (Mark i. 35; Luke v. 16). Sometimes worn in body, and sometimes in distress of mind it was His to regain the virtue which had left Him, and to receive

"Authentic tidings of invisible things;
Of ebb and flow and ever-during power;
And central peace subsisting at the heart
Of endless agitation."

And frequently for the same besetting purpose of the spirit "He goeth up into the mountain." Luke mentions that He went out into the mountain to pray: and He continued all night in prayer to God (vi. 12). That was before the choosing of the Twelve, and it would seem that either before or after some such moment of the ministry Jesus was in the practice of taking to the heights (Mark iii. 13; Luke vi. 12; Mark vi. 46; Matthew xiv. 23; Mark ix. 2; Luke ix. 28; Matthew xvii. 1; John vi. 3, 15).

It is deeply significant in this connexion to find it stated —by Luke alone—(xxi. 37) that at the close of His ministry "during the days He was teaching in the Temple; but during the nights leaving (the Temple) He used to go and lodge on the mount."

Wordsworth says that the language of the ancient hills

"Aids the thoughts,
However multitudinous, to move
With order and relation,"

and of one, a herdsman on the lonely mountain tops, that

"Early hath he learned
To reverence the volume that displays
The mystery, the life which cannot die;
But in the mountains did he *feel* his faith.
All things, responsive to the writing, there
Breathed immortality, revolving life,
And greatness still revolving; infinite:
There littleness was not; the least of things
Seemed infinite; and there his spirit shaped
Her prospects, nor did he believe,—he *saw*."

Of Jesus, too, going, as His custom was, to the mountains at decisive hours, may we not say that there His spirit shaped her prospects, and He saw? His faith rose to the pitch or point of vision. And things, "all things," were revealed to Him of His Father, and power was with Him to reveal Things little as well as great, flowers growing at His feet

and sparrows falling, as well as the mysteries of the kingdom, and the spirits of the blest (Mark ix. 4). It was the same eye so full of light that He brought to Nature as to man. Amid the toil and labour of His days it was His joy to turn aside, and fix its gaze, both long and deep, upon the lilies of the field. It has been said that "almost all Christ's moral precepts might be paralleled or illustrated by something in Hebrew or Jewish Literature. The praise of the beauty of flowers cannot, apparently, be so paralleled. Of all Christ's sayings it is the most original." Once again a bent or tendency of spirit set so deep as this must have been in Him from His youth up, and have grown with the vast conceptions and ideals which gradually became His own as He strove with them in lonely places, and in communings of the night and day. And perhaps one might suggest that a poem like "The Prelude" of Wordsworth, with its unrivalled picture of the growth of a soul through intercourse with Nature has that in it which may help us to imagine something of the way by which Nature, manifestly a potent influence in His life, so much more even than in that of any Hebrew poet or prophet, acted on His soul and wrought in Him the passions which build up character, and the pieties which exalt it.

To conclude, the Scriptures, Home and Nature, these three, entering as they do profoundly into the whole course of Jesus' public life, lead us to infer by the light which they cast behind, that they were the forces, or some of them, which operated in His long sequestered years at Nazareth, and by virtue of which He advanced in wisdom, and in grace with God and man. How rich in growth these hidden years within the home and homeland were is proved by the riches both of grace and wisdom, of vision and the endless life, which are made manifest and shine forth as the sun in the brief and burning records of His mission on the earth.

James Robertson Cameron.

INDEX.

PAGE

Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D.
Why "According to Matthew"? . 289

Rev. Professor Vernon Bartlet, D.D.
William Sanday, The Man and his Message . 445

Rev. W. Ernest Beet, M.A., Litt.D.
The Mystery of the Sealed Book 414

Rev. T. Herbert Bindley, D.D.
John vii. 37, 38 443

Professor Vacher Burch.
The Original Arrangement of the Sermon on the Mount 149

Rev. Professor C. F. Burney, Litt.D.
Our Lord's Old Testament Reference in St. John vii. 37, 38 385

Rev. J. Robertson Cameron, D.D.
Some Notes on the Development of Jesus . 447

Rev. Professor J. A. Findlay, M.A.
The Book of Testimonies and the Structure of the First Gospel 388

Rev. Canon J. Battersby Harford, M.A.
Handley Carr Glyn Moule 84

Professor Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D.
A Further Note on the Original Title of St. Mark . 442
Rivers of Living Water . . 496
A Primitive Onomasticon . 401

Rev. John A. Hutton, D.D.
An Hard Saying 232

Rev. Professor George Jackson, B.A., D.D.
The Work of the Christian Ministry in a Period of Theological Decay and Reconstruction . 432

Rev. J. G. James, D.D.
Prayer and Personality 281

Rev. J. P. Lilley, D.D.
William Robertson Smith: Recollections of a Fellow-Student. I . . . 61
II 126

Rev. Professor J. E. McFadyen, D.D.
History and Homiletics: a Study in Samuel xxi. 1–14 241

PAGE

Rev. J. G. McKenzie, B.A.
Our Conception of God 222

Rev. Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.D.
Jesus Christ and Prayer 31
The Vital Interest of the Church in Pure Doctrine . . 371

Rev. Professor D. S. Margoliouth, Litt.D.
Arguments from the Pentateuch for the Future Life . 104

Rev. Professor Rabbi A. Marmorstein, Ph.D.
Ecclesiastes xii. 6 203

Rev. Professor J. Hugh Michael, M.A.
St. Mark iv. 10–12: An Interpretation 311

Rev. Professor James Moffatt, D.D., Litt.D.
Pickings from the New Papyri 138

Professor A. S. Peake, D.D.
Dr. Sanday 321

Rev. Professor A. T. Robertson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D.
The Christ of St. Luke's Gospel 1

Rev. Professor T. H. Robinson, M.A., B.D.
The Structure of the Book of Jeremiah 17

Rev. J. M. E. Ross, M.A.
The Point of Strain in Christian Ethic 208

Rev. Professor J. M. Shaw, M.A.
Can Faith be Indifferent to the Bodily Resurrection of our Lord? 47

Rev. E. Shillito, M.A.
The Beginning of the Last Action: a Study of St. Mark's Gospel, Chapter xi. 363

Professor A. Souter, Litt.D.
William Sanday 335

Rev. Professor James Stalker, D.D.
A Revolution in New Testament Criticism . . . 348

A. T. Swaine.
Relativity and the Deity of Jesus Christ . . . 273

Rev. H. C. A. Townsend, D.D.
Our Conception of God 222

Rev. Professor Adam C. Welch, D.D.
Joel and the Post-Exilic Community 161

Rev. G. H. Whitaker, M.A.
Ἀλήθεια in the New Testament and in Polybius . . . 76

Rev. E. W. Winstanley, D.D.
The Outlook of the Apologists 180

INDEX TO SUBJECTS.

PAGE

"According to Matthew" . . 289
Ἀλήθεια in the New Testament and in Polybius 76
An Hard Saying 232
Apologists, The Outlook of the . 180
Arguments from the Pentateuch for the Future Life . . . 104
Beginning of the Last Action, The: A Study of St. Mark's Gospel, Chapter xi. 363
Bodily Resurrection of our Lord: Can Faith be Indifferent to the 47
Book of Testimonies and the Structure of the First Gospel, The 388
Christ of St. Luke's Gospel, The . 1
Christian Ethic, The Point of Strain in 208
Conception of God, Our . . . 222
Deity of Jesus Christ, Relativity and the 273
Development of Jesus, Some Notes on the 447
Ecclesiastes xii. 6 203
First Gospel, Structure of the . . 388
Future Life, Arguments from the Pentateuch for 104
History and Homiletics: A Study in Samuel xxi. 1–14 . . . 241
Jeremiah, The Structure of the Book of 17
Jesus, The Development of . . 447
Jesus Christ and Prayer . . . 31
Joel and the Post-Exilic Community 161
John vii. 37, 38 . . . 385, 443
Moule, Handley Carr Glyn . . 81
Mystery of the Sealed Book, The . 114
Original Arrangement of the Sermon on the Mount, The . . . 149
Original Title of St. Mark, A Further Note on the . . . 142

PAGE

Our Conception of God . . . 222
Our Lord's Old Testament Reference in St. John vii. 37, 38 . 385
Outlook of the Apologists, The . . 180
Pickings from the New Papyri . 138
Point of Strain in Christian Ethic, The 208
Prayer and Personality . . . 281
Prayer, Jesus Christ and . . . 31
Primitive Onomasticon, A . . 401
Pure Doctrine, The Vital Interest of the Church in 371
Relativity and the Deity of Jesus Christ 273
Revolution in New Testament Criticism, A 348
Rivers of Living Water . . . 196
St. John vii. 37, 38, Our Lord's O.T. Reference in 385
St. Luke's Gospel, The Christ of . 1
St. Mark, A Further Note on the Original Title of 142
St. Mark's Gospel, Chapter xi., A Study in 363
St. Mark iv. 10–12: An Interpretation 311
2 Samuel xxi. 1–14, A Study in 241
Sanday, Dr. William . 321, 335, 415
Sermon on the Mount, The Original Arrangement in the . . 149
Smith, William Robertson: Recollections of a Fellow-Student, 61, 126
Structure of the Book of Jeremiah, The 17
Structure of the First Gospel, The 388
Vital Interest of the Church in Pure Doctrine, The 371
Work of the Christian Ministry in a Period of Theological Decay and Reconstruction, The 432

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE
Gen. xxvi. 24	111
xxviii. 13	111
xl. 7	258
xlv. 4	260
Exod. iii. 6	111
vi. 4	105
xi. 38	5
xxiv. 11	107
Deut. iv. 4	106
xxiv. 16	246
1 Sam. xiv. 39,	257
xvi. 18	253
xviii. 8	256
xxii. 20	253
xxiv. 6, 10	255
xxvi. 9, 11	255
2 Sam. ix. 7, 13	255
xvi. 5–7	254
xvi. 1–4	256
1 Kings ii. 46	253
1 Chron. xxii. 8	253
Ps. xliv. 1	242
Prov. iii. 3–4	458
Eccles. xii. 6	203–207
Isaiah ii. 3	202
iv. 1	444
xii. 2	443
xiv. 3	444
lv. 1 ff.	386
lviii. 11	444
Jerem. ii. 13	386, 445
iii. 17	202
vi. 22	20
l. 41	20
Lam. iv. 20	6
Ezek. xviii. 4	246
xlvii. 9	386
Dan. vii. 13 f.	13
Joel ii. 28	444
iii. 5	165
iii. 18	386, 444
iii. 1	165
Zech. xiv. 3	202
xiv. 8	386, 444
Matt. iii. 17	7
v. 1–8	152
v. 16	152
v. 20	152
vi. 16–18	152
vii. 6	152
vii. 29	389
viii. 22	232
x. 40	466
x. 42	469
xi. 25–28	447
xvi. 16	9
xvi. 17	7
xviii. 10	467
xxii. 23, 28	108
xxii. 24	109
xxii. 30	108
xxvi. 63, 64	10
Mark i. 11	7
i. 45	470
iv. 10–12	311–320
v. 19	463
v. 43	464
vi. 31	470
viii. 29	7
ix. 37	466
ix. 41	469
xii. 24	108
xiv. 13–16	464
xiv. 62	10
Luke i. 32–33	4
i. 35	5, 48
i. 43	6
ii. 26	6
ii. 40	12
ii. 49	7
ii. 52	12
iii. 22	7–8
iii. 38	5
iv. 3, 9	8
v. 21	8
v. 24	8
vi. 5	9
viii. 28	9
viii. 55	464
ix. 20	6, 9
ix. 22	15
ix. 35	9
ix. 42	464
ix. 48	466
Luke x. 16	466
xxii. 44	12
xxii. 67, 70	10
xxii. 69	10, 13
xxiii. 53	1
xxiv. 26	15
John i. 33, 34	7
iv. 14	443
v. 18	7
vii. 15	459
vii. 37, 38	200, 443
viii. 32	79
xii. 44–45	466
xiii. 20	466
xiv. 17	7
xiv. 24	466
xv. 23	466
xv. 26	79
xvi. 13	79
Acts xvii. 28	7
Rom. ii. 2	80
viii. 11	56
viii. 23	61
2 Cor. vi. 7	80
Eph. i. 13	80
iv. 16	451
iv. 24	78, 80
Phil. i. 23	113
iii. 21	56
Col. i. 5	80
i. 6	79
ii. 19	451
1 Tim. ii. 4	79
iv. 3	29
2 Tim. ii. 15	80
ii. 25	79
iii. 7	79
Titus i. 1	79
Heb. x. 26	79
James i. 18	80
i. 21	80
i. 25	80
2 Peter i. 12	80
1 John ii. 8	78
iv. 6	79
2 John i.	79
Rev. i. 18	49

Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner, Frome and London

GTU Library
3 2400 00276 5778

Expositor

JUN 24 '60

APR 16 '71

ser.8
v.20
1920:2

CBPac

ser.8
v.20
1920:2